

RELATIVE CLAUSES IN THE
PAULINE HOMOLOGOMENA AND ANTILEGOMENA

Hiram J. Lester

A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty
of the Graduate School of Yale University
in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of
Philosophy

1973

SUMMARY

This dissertation examines all of the relative clauses in the thirteen epistles known as the Pauline Corpus. Its aim is to ascertain what evidence relating to the authenticity of the Antilegomena will result from such a systematic analysis. In keeping with the current scholarly consensus the authenticity of the Pauline Homologoumena is assumed. This provides the test group with which the style of the relative clauses in each of the Antilegomena is compared.

The evidence is presented in four chapters. Chapter I examines the relationship between the relative clause and its head or antecedent (i.e. phrase-level). Chapter II discusses the forms and functions of the relative words (i.e. word-level). Chapter III analyzes constituent order within the relative clauses themselves (i.e. clause-level). Chapter IV summarizes the general conclusions of the study, the secondary results which will be useful for Pauline studies, and five new directions which are indicated as fruitful for future study.

The method of presentation in each chapter is (1) a description of the relative clause style of the Homologoumena at a particular linguistic level. (2) That is followed by a comparison of the relative clauses in each of the Antilegomena to the style description from the first part. (3) The third section compares the two sub-groups within the Antilegomena: Colossians-Ephesians and I Timothy-II Timothy-Titus.

This study concludes that there is strong evidence for denying the authenticity of each of the Antilegomena (less for II Thessalonians than the others). This conclusion is shared by many, but not most, New Testament scholars. In contrast to the current consensus, this study finds good evidence at every linguistic level to argue (1) that the Pastoral Epistles are closer to the Homologoumena in style than are Colossians or Ephesians, and (2) that Ephesians is more like the dominant style of the Homologoumena than is Colossians.

PREFACE

This writer has had the very good fortune to have had eight remarkable, scholarly teachers in New Testament. To each of them he owes a debt of gratitude which he can only pay by the cultivation of excellence in teaching, by an unswerving pursuit of truth, and by further efforts to contribute to the scholarly quest.

Nils Alstrup Dahl of Yale University has been more than the advisor to this dissertation. He has been a support in adversity and a sympathetic friend at all times. When we were working in the same areas, he willingly shared the results of his own research. By doing so, he has embodied the lesson that critical scholarship is a cooperative venture. He has made his home available to me during vacations and has given generously of his time and interest to every stage of this project. His extensive knowledge, precision in craftsmanship, and sensitivity to the particular demands of this project have been both a constant inspiration and an invaluable aid.

The late Paul Schubert of Yale was my first dissertation advisor. In him were combined the best of the scholarly traditions of his German background and his own favorite teacher, Professor Martin Dibelius, with the pragmatism of his adopted homeland. Throughout

his long teaching career the exegetical and theological insights of a form and function analysis of the New Testament text inspired both his colleagues and his students. From him I learned the value of re-opening old questions and an appreciation for the little words in a text.

Paul S. Minear, recently retired from Yale University, is the only professor dealing with the New Testament area who has continued at Yale throughout most of my tenure. Although not the advisor of this project, he gave it many hours and much interest. His critical comments have always been perceptive and useful. His ecumenical spirit, his creative approach to exegesis and his concern that Biblical scholarship serve the Church will be a continuing legacy for me and for all his students.

Paul Meyer, formerly of Yale University and now of Vanderbilt University, was my first advisor in graduate school. He caused more students to want to study the Greek language than any other teacher I have ever known. He set a model for keen critical scholarship, for self-criticism, and for quiet humility that is easy to remember, but difficult to immitate.

The late Erwin Goodenough of Yale University was one of the most exciting teachers and persons I have ever known. His contributions to the scholarship of the Graeco-Roman period are well-known everywhere. An avid

polemicist with an unending curiosity, he made every seminar session an exciting learning experience. Although a professing agnostic, he was without peers in his religious sensitivity.

Abraham Malherbe never taught a class in which I was enrolled. He too has given unstintingly of his time to this project. His well-stated questions and criticisms have helped me learn how to state an argument. My own students at Bethany College are already benefitting from those lessons.

Alfred Illingworth, formerly of Phillips University and now at the University of Missouri, first introduced me to the Paul of the Roman Epistle. His ability to present Pauline thought fairly and fully, although he did not agree theologically with Paul, set a high standard for my own teaching. His recent recognition as the outstanding teacher at the University of Missouri is well deserved.

Stephen J. England of Phillips University was my first professor of New Testament. His teaching shaped my ideas and style more than any other man. His courageous scholarship and rigorous honesty has had a formative influence on several generations of Christian ministers and scholars. When my students, coming under critical scrutiny, hear the phrase, "what does the text say?" then they know the continuing influence of the Dean.

My colleagues in the teaching of New Testament at Bethany College, Robert Preston, Richard Kenney, Jerry Folk and Burton Thurston, not only increase the joys of teaching, but also have encouraged and assisted the project in every way possible. James Dittes of Yale University and Dean Barrie Richardson of Bethany College have helped to arrange leave time and assisted in many ways.

Naturally my deepest debt is to my wife and son. Throughout twenty years of marriage I have always been in an academic degree program of some kind. When things were difficult, they were patient. Always they have made the necessary sacrifices.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Chapter	
I THE PAULINE RELATIVE CLAUSES AND THEIR ANTECEDENTS.....	24
A. Relatives and Antecedents in the Homologoumena.....	
1. Adjectival Clauses.....	27
2. Substantival Relative Clauses.....	35
3. Independent Relative Clauses.....	43
4. Adverbial Relative Clauses.....	47
5. Summary.....	49
B. Relatives and Antecedents in the Antilegomena.....	
1. General Contrasts.....	51
2. II Thessalonians.....	54
3. Colossians.....	56
4. Ephesians.....	59
5. I Timothy.....	64
6. II Timothy.....	66
7. Titus.....	69
C. Conclusions.....	
1. Homogeneity of the Relative Clauses of the Homologoumena.....	70
2. The Antilegomena Contrasts with the Homologoumena.....	71
3. Comparison of Styles Within Antilegomena.....	72
4. Traditional Liturgical Formulas and Style.....	82

Excursus I: The Style of Colossians and Its Relative Clauses.....	84
1. Carefully Constructed Sentences.....	85
2. Appositional Style.....	87
3. Consistency of Style.....	92
4. Relative Clauses and the Style of Colossians.....	94
5. Summary Conclusions.....	100
Excursus II: The Style of Ephesians.....	102
1. The Problem.....	102
2. Self-conscious Style.....	108
3. Basic Style--Successive Subordination.....	111
4. Consistency of Style.....	119
5. Ephesians, Colossians, and the Question of Hymnic Style.....	121
6. Relative Clauses and the Style of Ephesians.....	122
7. Summary Conclusions.....	126
II THE RELATIVES OF THE PAULINE CORPUS.....	129
Introduction.....	129
A. The relatives of the Homologoumena.....	130
1. Are there one, two, or three relatives.....	130
2. Particles used with the Relatives.....	144
3. The Form of the Relative.....	151
4. The Functions of the Relatives.....	159
5. Summary.....	167
B. The Relatives of the Antilegomena.....	170
1. The Antilegomena Contrasts Generally.....	170
2. II Thessalonians.....	173
3. Colossians.....	176
4. Ephesians.....	182
5. I Timothy.....	187
6. II Timothy.....	191
7. Titus.....	195
C. Conclusions.....	197
1. The Homogeneity of the Style of the Homologoumena.....	198
2. The Antilegomena Contrast.....	198
3. Comparison of the Styles of the Antilegomena.....	199

4. Traditional Liturgical Formulas
and Style.....203

III CONSTITUENT ORDER IN THE PAULINE RELATIVE
CLAUSES.....204

A. Constituent Order in the Homologoumena.....	206
1. Behaghel's Law.....	208
2. Construction Class and Constituent Order.....	210
3. Clause Type and Constituent Order.....	220
4. Emphasis.....	230
5. Traditional Formulations.....	235
6. Summary.....	244

B. Constituent Order Among the Antilegomena.....	246
1. The Common Language Context: An Overview.....	246
2. II Thessalonians.....	249
3. Colossians.....	252
4. Ephesians.....	258
5. I Timothy.....	264
6. II Timothy.....	267
7. Titus.....	270

C. Conclusions.....	272
1. The Style of the Homologoumena.....	273
2. The Antilegomena Contrast with the Homologoumena.....	273
3. Comparison of Styles Within the Antilegomena.....	274

Excursus III: Clause types and Constituent Orders.....	278
1. Determining Clause Types.....	278
2. Transitive Clauses.....	280
3. Di-transitive Clauses.....	286
4. Modal Clauses.....	289
5. Intransitive Clauses.....	292
6. Equative Clauses.....	295
7. Attributive Clauses.....	301

IV	CONCLUSIONS, SECONDARY RESULTS, AND NEW DIRECTIONS.....	304
	A. Conclusions.....	305
	B. Secondary Results.....	307
	1. Style Description.....	307
	2. One, Two, or Three Relatives?.....	307
	3. Close Relationship Between Form and Function.....	308
	4. Biblical Greek.....	308
	5. Traditional Materials.....	309
	C. New Directions.....	310
	1. Form and Function Studies of New Testament Language.....	310
	2. Hymnic Style and Traditional Fragments.....	310
	3. Pseudonymity and Style.....	311
	4. Epistolary Uses of Relative Clauses.....	312
	D. Relative Clauses and Paul's Argumentative Style.....	313
	1. Paul's Style Characterized.....	314
	2. The Argumentative Use of Relative Clauses.....	315
	3. Argumentative Relative Clauses and Authenticity.....	322
APPENDIX	I: ADJECTIVAL RELATIVE CLAUSES.....	331
APPENDIX	II: SUBSTANTIVAL FUNCTIONS OF THE ANTECEDENTS OF ADJECTIVAL RELATIVE CLAUSES.....	341
APPENDIX	III: SUBSTANTIVAL RELATIVE CLAUSES.....	344
APPENDIX	IV: INDEFINITE RELATIVE CLAUSES.....	351
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	358

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Constituent Function Abbreviations	22
II. Construction Type Abbreviations	23
III. Relative Clause Antecedents	33
IV. Antecedent Constituent Functions	36
V. Distribution of the Three Relatives	133
VI. Distribution of Relative Forms	152
VII. Relative Constituent Functions	160
VIII. Position of Oblique Personal Pronouns	219
IX. Constituent Patterns	221
X. Distribution of Clause Types	229
XI. Adverbial Functions of Relative Clauses	326

INTRODUCTION

Almost two hundred years of serious critical scholarship have failed to produce agreement on the authorship of all thirteen epistles of the Pauline Corpus.

Arguments, both for and against the Pauline authorship of particular epistles, have been most frequently drawn from observations on language and style,¹ although literary

¹The first authors to deny the authenticity of certain New Testament writings on the basis of language and style were Origen (who denied the Pauline authorship of Hebrews) and Dionysius of Alexandria (who denied the Johannine authorship of the Apocalypse). Cf. Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History, Bk. VI. Sect. xxv, lines 11-14 on Origen and Bk. VII. Sect. xxiv, lines 6-8 and Bk. VII. Sect. xxv, lines 24-27 on Dionysius (The Loeb Classical Edition (Cambridge, 1932), Vol. II. pp. 78-79, 199, and 207-208 respectively.)

Although Erasmus of Rotterdam stated that the style of Eph was so different from the other Pauline letters ut alterius videri possit, he did not deny the authenticity of that epistle (Annotaciones in Nouum Testamentum (Basel, 1519). Opera Omnia (Lugduni Batavorum, 1705), Vol. VI. p. 831. This information is taken from Ernst Percy, Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe (Lund, 1946), p. 1).

Modern scientific study of the authenticity of the Pauline epistles begins with Friedrich Ernst David Schleiermacher. He disputed the authenticity of I Timothy because, among other reasons, its vocabulary was markedly different from the Pauline epistles taken as a whole (Über den sogenannten ersten Brief des Paulos an den Timotheos. Ein kritisches Sendschreiben an J.C. Gass. (1807). Sämtliche Werke I, 2 (1836), pp. 223-320). Johan Gottfried Eichhorn went a step further denying the authenticity of all three Pastoral epistles on a similar basis of non-Pauline language and historical situation (Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 1st ed. (1812), Vol. III. pp. 315-410. I am indebted to Werner Georg Kümmel, Das Neue Testament, Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme (Munich, 1958), pp. 100f. and to Albert Schweitzer, Paul and his Interpreters, A Critical History, W. Montgomery, Trans. (New York, 1912, 1964), pp. 7-9, for the treatment of Schleiermacher and Eichhorn which were unavailable to me.

and theological relationships and alleged backgrounds and

Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette (Historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament (1826), pp. 256-264) first denied the Pauline authorship of Ephesians on the basis of (1) its literary relationship to Colossians, (2) its verbosity in piling up relative clauses, participles, prepositional phrases and genitives in sentences in a way uncharacteristic of Paul, (3) its peculiar phrases, and (4) its address.

Ferdinand Christian Baur is the first watershed in critical Pauline studies. Making use of the critical works of earlier scholars and applying a Hegelian model to the study of early Christianity, he denied the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, and questioned the authenticity of Eph and Col strongly and of Phil and the Thessalonian correspondence to a lesser degree. On the Pastorals, see his Die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus aufs neue kritisch untersucht (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1835); and also his Die Einleitung in das Neue Testament als theologische Wissenschaft, Theologische Jahrbücher, F. C. Baur and E. Zeller, eds. Vol. X (1851), pp. 294-296. On the other epistles see his Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein Leben und wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristenthums (Stuttgart, 1845), passim.

Baur regarded the critical methods which sought to establish that a particular epistle could not have been written by a particular author as "negative" criticism. Positive criticism meant locating that epistle in its historical context in a theory of the development of early Christianity. See Die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe, III, esp. 1-94. Because he was more concerned with "positive criticism", Baur did not add much to the linguistic arguments already advanced. Nonetheless his radical methods forced the next several generations of scholars to turn diligently to the text, either to dispute or defend Baur's theories.

The next watershed is found in the work of Heinrich Julius Holtzmann who did the most thorough work of gathering the linguistic data related to authenticity. He sought to establish that Colossians was an authentic Pauline epistle reworked by a later hand, while Ephesians was a revision of the earlier copy of Colossians interwoven with the other Pauline epistles. (Kritik der Epheser- und Kolosserbriefe (Leipzig, 1872)). He argued that the Pastoral Epistles and II Thessalonians were not by Paul. He denied the former on the basis of vocabulary and language--Die Pastoralbriefe kritisch und exegetisch untersucht (, 1880); and the latter on the basis of literary relationship to I Thessalonians--Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das neue Testament (Leipzig, 1885, 1888, 1892). Although some scholars since Holtzmann

opponents have also been so used. Usually the debate has

have supplemented his detailed work and others have disputed his conclusions, it is to his credit that 1) most have accepted his judgment on the Pastorals, 2) no one after him would separate Ephesians from Colossians in supposing that the question of the authenticity of Ephesians can be separated from its relationship to Colossians; and 3) his detailed linguistic work has never been superceded. See the evaluation of Holtzmann's detailed scholarship in Albert Schweitzer, Paul and His Interpreters, A Critical History, W. Montgomery, trans. (New York, 1964), pp. 25-27; and Ernst Percy, Die Probleme der Kolosser--und Epheserbriefe (Lund, 1946), pp. 1-7.

Several notable studies concerned primarily with authenticity have been written in the Twentieth Century. In 1921 P.N. Harrison sought to give the use of linguistic evidence a more "scientific" cast. (The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles (Oxford, 1921). Harrison supplemented this work with a second Pauline and Pastorals (London, 1964). Using word statistics and extensive charts, he showed (1) that the Pastorals differed markedly from the remaining Pauline epistles in vocabulary, use of particles, grammar and the style and (2) that just in those ways in which the language of the Pastorals was unlike Paul it resembled the Greek of the second century. Harrison opened himself to much criticism because he compared individual pages and chose to identify certain passages as authentic (The Problem, pp. 87-136. Paulines, pp. 106-128). However, the later improved statistical method of Grayston and Herdan has basically confirmed Harrison's conclusions. K. Grayston and G. Herdan, "The Authorship of the Pastorals in the Light of Statistical Linguistics," New Testament Studies, VI (1959-60), pp. 1ff.

The Pauline authorship of Ephesians and Colossians has been defended by Ernst Percy in his exhaustive Die Probleme der Kolosser--und Epheserbriefe. In it he examines peculiarities of vocabulary, constructions, grammar and style, as well as comparative frequencies of characteristic linguistic phenomena found in both the Homologoumena and Colossians and/or Ephesians. Although he apparently convinced only those scholars who already agreed with him, he contributed significantly to the broadening of the linguistic data which must be considered and he established his work beside Holtzmann's as a collection of data with which any future scholar must deal.

while the foregoing survey has not been exhaustive, it has at least shown the centrality of the utilization of linguistic phenomena in all arguments on the authenticity of particular epistles. A survey of the works cited above will also demonstrate that most studies have concentrated on word and phrase-level constructions (i.e. vocabulary, particles,

been just that, a gathering of evidence and arguments, either pro or con. Never, to the knowledge of this writer, has any scholar systematically examined all of the cases of a particular phenomenon in the Corpus so that a total picture might emerge within which critical judgments might be made. It is by completing such a thorough examination that this dissertation seeks to make a contribution to Biblical scholarship.

1. Aim

The aim of this dissertation is to analyze and describe all of the relative clauses of the thirteen epistles of the Pauline Corpus and to present the evidence related to questions of authenticity which results from such an analysis. It is not anticipated that the evidence which is produced by this thorough examination will be conclusive in establishing or denying the authenticity of any given epistle. Nonetheless, by its systematic character, it is hoped that it will make a reliable contribution to the evidence that has been accumulated for or against the authenticity of each of the six Pauline Antilegomena.

2. Secondary Results

In addition to producing reliable stylistic evidence on questions of authenticity, it is anticipated that the study may have several useful secondary results.

prepositional phrases, appositives, and genitives). Only in part do Percy and de Wette remain exceptions to this observation.

(1) It may make a positive contribution to the effort to describe the style of the Apostle Paul (and of the authors of the Antilegomena). With few exceptions that description has heretofore seldom gotten beyond the emotive level, and has never been thoroughly and analytically done.²

(2) The study may make contributions, both positive and negative, to the effort to discover criteria which identify traditional formulae.³ The evidence used to identify such

²The most notable exceptions to the claim that the majority of references to Pauline style have been emotive are the following: Rudolf Bultmann, Der Stil der Paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe. No. 13 of Forschungen zur Religion und Literature des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Wilhelm Bousset, Ed. (Göttingen, 1910.); Ernst Adolf Alfred Oskar Von Dobschutz, "Zum Wortschatz und Stil des Römerbriefs," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche, XXXIII (1934); Joachim Jeremias, "Chiasmus in den Paulusbriefen." Abba: Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte. (Göttingen, 1966); Nils Wilhelm Lund, Chiasmus in the New Testament, A Study in Formgeschichte. (Chapel Hill, 1942); Eduard Norden, Die antike Kunstprosa (Stuttgart, 1958), Vol. II, pp. 492-510; Johannes Weiss, Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik (Göttingen, 1897, 1917).

³The fifty years of research and debate on the origin (Biblical and otherwise) of the Apostles' Creed, the Roman Symbol and other ancient creedal statements furnishes both the historical background and the impetus for efforts to discover and describe liturgical materials in the New Testament. A brief history of this research is given in Vernon H. Neufeld, The Earliest Christian Confessions (Grand Rapids, 1963), pp. 1-12; more details of this history are found in the sources cited by Neufeld (*Ibid.*, p. 1, n.5).

The real foundation for all successive studies of traditional materials within the New Testament was laid in 1912 by Eduard Norden in his now classic Agnostos Theos (All references are to the 1956 edition, a photocopy of the 1923 edition, produced for Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft of Darmstadt). This book was devoted to a history of the style of prayer and praise or predication formulae. It was basically concerned to distinguish Hellenic and Jewish or Oriental formulae, both of which make intensive use of participles and relative clauses.

formulae varies greatly from text to text and seems to have

While Norden's argument is much more complex than this, for the purposes of this dissertation the criteria for the Jewish praise formulae are the most important result of his effort. These are (1) the introduction of cola with a substantival participle at the beginning of the series rather than at the end (*Ibid.*, pp. 177-201), (2) the preference for clause or thought parallelism through successive participial phrases and/or relative clauses (*Ibid.*), (3) the use of relative clauses in such a series of adjectival constructions, and (4) the placing of the verb first is, after clause in the earliest position possible (*Ibid.*, pp. 201-207). In appendices he noted that (5) Semitic parallelism, as opposed to Hellenic, often repeated important words (*Ibid.*, pp. 355-357), and (6) putting the verb first is, after clause parallelism, the most certain and common Semitism in the New Testament (*Ibid.*, p. 365). He showed how these criteria serve to identify Col 1:12-20 and I Tim 3:16 as early Christian predications based on a Jewish model.

After Norden the study of early Christian liturgical materials has proceeded in several directions. The most common direction has been to study in detail materials within the Pauline letters which are assumed to be from the pre-Pauline church liturgy. There is not space to list comprehensively such scholarly ventures. Among the more important are: Ernst Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus; Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2:5-11. No. 18: Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse* (Heidelberg, 1927-28); R.P. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippons II. 5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship. Vol IV: Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series*, Matthew Black, ed. (Cambridge, 1967); James M. Robinson, "A Formal Analysis of Col 1:15-20," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxxvi (1957), pp. 87-106; Nils Alstrup Dahl, "Adresse und Proömium des Epheserbriefes," *Theologische Zeitschrift* VII (1951), pp. 241-264; Georg Strecher, "Redaktion und Tradition im Christushymnus Phil 2:6-11." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche*, LV (1964), pp. 63-78; Jack T. Sanders, "Hymnic elements in Ephesians 1-3." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche*. Ed. by Walther Eltester. LVI (1965); James M. Robinson, "Die Hodajot-Formel in Gebet und Hymnus des Frühchristentums." *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen*. Walther Eltester and F.H. Kettler, eds. Vol. 30 of *Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche*. (Berlin, 1964); Robert H. Gundry, "The Form, Meaning, and Background of the Hymn Quoted in I Timothy 3:16." *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce on his*

been discovered in the alleged traditional materials after

60th Birthday. Edited by W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin. (Grand Rapids, 1970); Dieter Georgi, "Der vorpaulinische Hymnus Phil 2, 6-11." Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag. Erich Dinkler, ed. (Tübingen, 1964); Günther Bornkann, "Das Bekenntnis im Hebräerbrief." Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum: Gesammelte Aufsätze Band II. Vol. 28 of Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie. E. Wolf, ed. (München, 1959); Ernst Kasemann, "A Primitive Christian Baptismal Liturgy," Essays on New Testament Theology. W.J. Montague, trans. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 41. (London: SCM Press Ltd. 1964); Rudolf Bultmann, "Bekenntnis - und Liedfragmente im ersehen Petrusbrief." Coniectanea Neotestamentica XI in honorem Antonii Fridrichsen Sexagenarii. (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1947); Joseph Kroll, Die christliche Hymnodik bis zu Klemens von Alexandria, Verzeichnis der Vorlesungen an der Akademie zu Braunsberg (1921-22) Photographically by Wissenschaftlichen Buchgesellschaft (Darmstadt, 1968); Vernon H. Neufeld, The Earliest Christian Confessions. Vol. 5: New Testament Tools and Studies. Bruce M. Metzger, ed. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1963); Oscar Cullmann, The Earliest Christian Confessions. J.K.S. Reid, Trans. (London, 1949), and Hans Lietzmann, Symbolstudies I-XIV, Vol. III: Kleine Schriften. 5th Ser., Vol. 19 of Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur (Berlin, 1962).

Others have sought to make comprehensive studies of particular liturgical forms, such as hymns, prayers and confessions. (Kroll, Neufeld, Cullmann, Lietzmann.).

A third group of scholars has sought to examine the evidence for pre-Pauline Christian and Jewish tradition, especially cultic-tradition, in Paul's Epistles. (Cf. e.g. Archibald M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, 2nd rev. ed. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961)). A fourth group has sought either to locate in the cultus all or major portions of some epistles or else to find particular epistles "salted" with cultic reminiscences. (Gottfried Schille, Frühchristliche Hymnen (Berlin, 1962, 1965); and Ernest Percy, Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe (Lund, 1946).)

the material themselves were identified as traditional.

(3) If this should be the case then the study may lead to the delineation of certain traditional formulae which have heretofore gone unnoticed or, at least, without description.

(4) It may give some objective support to the claim made by Nigel Turner,⁴ Klaus Beyer,⁵ and others that the Greek of Paul (and perhaps of the entire Bible) has a special Semitic cast. (5) If it should give objective evidence of a special style for Biblical Greek, then it may make a contribution to the History of the Greek language, both in detail and in method of study. (6) Last, but not least, it may provide criteria for the interpretation of some of the relative clauses in their contexts.

3. Why Relative Clauses?

Although earlier works dealing with authenticity have seldom noted any special significance in the style of the relative clauses in a given epistle,⁶ there are a number of good reasons for choosing relative clauses for this study. In the first place, relative clauses are frequent

⁴Nigel Turner, Syntax. Vol. III of A Grammar of New Testament Greek by James Hope Moulton. (Edinburgh, 1963).

⁵Klaus Beyer, Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament; Bd. I, Satzlehre Teil 1, 2nd ed. (Göttingen, 1968).

⁶Only de Wette (Op. cit.), Percy (Op. cit.) and Schille (Früchristliche Hymnen and "Der Autor des Epheserbrief") have made significant use of relative clauses in arguing for or against the authenticity of any Antilegomenon.

in the Corpus, but the number is not unmanageable.⁷ Second,

⁷This study is limited to the relative clauses in the Pauline Corpus which are introduced by ὅς, ὅστις, or ὅσοι because these are the only relatives which occur frequently enough to make possible the analysis and description of style patterns and acceptable variations.

All of the relative clauses which are found in quotations taken from the Old Testament are excluded from consideration. This group of Old Testament quotations includes the relative clauses in: Rom 3:14; 4:7a, 7b, 8; 9:15a, 15b; 10:13; 11:4 (οἵτινες); 15:21a, 21b; I Cor 2:9a, 9b (ὅσα), 16; Gal 3:10.

The distribution of the three relatives in the Corpus is as follows:

	"ΟΣ	"ΟΣΤΙΣ	"ΟΣΟΙΣ	TOTALS
Romans	82	9	8	99
I Corinthians	58	4	1	63
II Corinthians	41	3	1	45
Galatians	23	7	5	35
Philippians	15	4	7	26
I Thessalonians	4	0	0	4
Philemon	5	0	0	5
Homologoumena	228	27	22	277
Total				
II Thessalonians	12	1	0	13
Colossians	37	4	1	42
Ephesians	33	4	0	37
I Timothy	22	3	1	26
II Timothy	20	3	1	24
Titus	9	1	0	10
Antilegomena	133	16	3	152
Total				
Pauline Corpus				
Totals	361	43	25	429

they are found in all types of material in the epistles and in every epistle.⁸ Third, they are good indicators of an author's style because they, in contrast to vocabulary, are not affected by subject matter and the choice of them is seldom conscious. Fourth, they manifest many of the characteristics of full sentences⁹ and yet, because they are generally shorter and less complex, they are more easily analyzed and described. Fifth, the presence of relative clauses, along with participles, is the most frequently alleged evidence for the presence of pre-Pauline liturgical materials in the Corpus.

4. The Criteria of Judgment

An author's style varies to some degree according to the length of a particular work,¹⁰ its aim and the

⁸Rom 1:5,6; and Gal 1:5 are found in epistolary introductions; Rom 16:27 occurs in an epistolary conclusion and benediction. I Cor 1:8 is found in a thanksgiving section; II Cor 1:4, 6 in an introduction blessing formulation; Rom 8:32 in a doctrinal section; I Cor 6:5 among paranetic materials; I Cor 11:23a, 23b in liturgical materials; II Cor 7:7 in personal reactions; and Gal 2:4b in narrative.

⁹Classical grammars have frequently asserted that relative clauses were originally independent sentences and only later became subordinate. Cf. e.g. Eduard Schwyzler, Op. cit., pp. 640 and 640, n. 1; K. Brugmann, Greek Grammar, 4th ed. Ed. by A. Thumb. (Munich, 1913), p. 122; A.N. Jannaris, An Historical Greek Grammar (London, 1897), p. 404; Buttman, Op. cit., p. 404; Edwin Mayser, Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, 2nd ed., 3rd rev. (1936), p. 77. Cf. also Chapter I, n. 33.

¹⁰Gustav Herdan has proven mathematically that proportion of peculiar traits per page increases in inverse relationship to the length of the document. Cf. among other his Type-Token Mathematics: A Textbook of Mathematical Linguistics (Gravenhage, 1960); Small

audience which he anticipates. As mentioned above, relative clauses are useful in this type of study because they are not usually chosen consciously by an author and they do not vary in most cases according to the aims of his work. Nonetheless, if one is to make useful judgments on the authenticity of certain works attributed to an author, he must have criteria of judgment which manifests both the author's basic style and the acceptable variations in his speech patterns.

For this reason, this dissertation assumes the authenticity, but not the integrity, of the seven epistles of the Pauline Homologoumena: Romans, I Corinthians, II Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, I Thessalonians, and Philemon. This assumption, although necessary, is a limiting feature of this study because (1) the style of these seven epistles is not without variation and (2) one must admit that the utilization of any other combination of epistles as the authentic standard might produce a different image of Paul's style. On the other hand, the variation within these seven will be useful in setting standards of acceptable variation in style by which the styles of the Antilegomena may be judged.

The assumption of the authenticity of the Homologoumena is amply justified by the history of Pauline scholarship. Not only must one have some criteria for

Particle Statistics (New York, 1960); Quantitative Linguistics (London, 1964); and "The Authorship of the Pastorals in the Light of Statistical Linguistics," New Testament Studies VI (1959-60), pp. 1-14.

judging the range of acceptable variation, but two hundred years of critical Pauline scholarship has reached the almost universal consensus that these seven epistles are authentic.¹¹

To work from this assumption is characteristic of most contemporary New Testament scholarship.¹²

¹¹There have been many attempts to deny the Pauline authorship one or more of the Homologoumena. The two most notable efforts were made by Ferdinand Christian Baur and the Tübingen School and by the advocates of "radical criticism". The former denied the authenticity of all of the epistles except Gal, I Cor, II Cor and Rom, because only these "pillar epistles" witnessed to the struggle between Paul and the Judaizers. This conclusion was generally rejected because it soon became evident that Hegelian philosophy imposed too narrow a framework on early Christianity. The radical critics (Bruno Bauer, et al) denied the authorship of all the Homologoumena, asserting that all were the products of the Antinomina controversy of the Second Century. Because the presuppositions and historical reconstructions of these critics could not withstand historical examination, their conclusions on Pauline authorship had to be rejected. Cf. Werner Georg Kummel, "Paulusbriefe," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 3rd ed., Kurt Galling, et. al., eds. (Tübingen, 1961), Vol. V. cols. 1950-198; Paul Feine, Johannes Behm and Werner Georg Kummel, Introduction to the New Testament. 14th rev. ed. A.J. Mattill, Jr., trans. (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965-6), pp. 176-177; Beda Rigaux, The Letters of St. Paul: Modern Studies, Stephen Yonick, trans. (Chicago, 1966), pp. 3-26, 100.

The presuppositions and method of A.Q. Morton and James McLernan who have sought to deny the Pauline authorship of Philippians and I Thessalonians on the basis of a simplified computer technique, has already been rejected by Gustav Herdan's review their earlier work on Christianity and the computer. A.Q. Morton and James McLernan, Christianity in the Computer Age (New York, 1964); and Paul, The Man and the Myth: A Study in the Authorship of Greek Prose (New York, 1966). Gustav Herdan, "Scholarship and the Computer," London Quarterly and Holborn Review XXXIV (1965), pp. 208-217.

¹²Among the many critical and theological studies which are based on the presupposition of the authenticity of the Homologoumena only, perhaps the following will suffice for illustration: Günther Bornkamm, Paul, D.M.G. Stalker, trans. (New York and Evanston, 1969), p. xiv; and Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Aenarick Grobel, trans. (New York, 1951), Vol. I. p. 190.

In spite of the weakness that this assumption imposes on this study, there is no alternative to it. Not only have attempts to discredit the authorship of these seven been singularly unsuccessful, but the vigorous efforts to support the Pauline authorship of any of the six Antilegomena have not been able to produce a significant consensus on behalf of Pauline authorship.¹³ Furthermore, the lack of analytic data for the Greek language as a whole means that there is no alternative at the present time to this basic assumption of the authenticity of the Homologoumena. This necessitates that any conclusions reached denying the authenticity of any of the Antilegomena must be tentative and corroborative, rather than ultimately conclusive.

5. The Method of Presentation

Because there is such a mass of details to be dealt with in analyzing the style of a writer or writers, the method of presentation must be orderly and clear, if the reader is to be able to perceive the argument and evaluate it. In looking at the avalanche of details at each level in the analysis of the relative clauses of the Pauline Corpus, four questions must be kept in mind in each instance:

¹³Feine, Behm, Kümmel (Op. cit., p. 178) and Rignaux (Op. cit., pp. 100-108) both point clearly to the lack of consensus in favor of the Pauline authorship of the Pauline authorship of a single one of the Antilegomena. The arrangement of the Sect. B of each of the four chapters of this dissertation treats the Antilegomena in the order of an increasing unlikelihood of Pauline authorship: II Th, Col, Eph, and Pastorals.

- (1) At what level in the linguistic hierarchy is a particular datum significant?¹⁴ (2) How does this phenomenon fit into the style and context of the epistle in which it is found?¹⁵ (3) How does this particular linguistic unit and the collective phenomena of the epistle in which it is found compare at the same linguistic level with the data in the Homologoumena and with that found in the various Antilegomena? (4) If the passage being examined has often been alleged to contain pre-Pauline materials, are there peculiar style traits which distinguish this relative clause from the other relative clauses of its epistolary context?¹⁶ (5) If

¹⁴The failure to distinguish the linguistic levels at which certain phenomena operate is a glaring error in the otherwise excellent work on Semitic syntax by Klaus Beyer. He speaks of relatives serving as the subject of both the relative clause and the head clause in sentences in which the relative clause is substantival. Klaus Beyer, Op. cit., pp. 141-196.

¹⁵Cf. e.g. Excurses I and II and Chap. IV. Sect. A.

¹⁶No one has yet attempted to do a critical analysis of the various criteria that are cited in different works as identifying characteristics of pre-Pauline materials. Probably the best and most widely used list of criteria is found in Ethelbert Stauffer, New Testament Theology, John Marsh, trans. (New York, 1955), pp. 338-339. Other lists can be extrapolated from Archibald M. Hunter, Op. cit.; Reinhard Deichgräber, Gottes hymnus und Christus Hymnus in der frühen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen. (Göttingen, 1967); and Ernest Percy, Op. cit., pp. 38-42.

However, regardless of the criteria cited as characteristic of liturgical materials in a particular passage, if that passage agrees in style with the characteristics of the entire epistle in which it is located, any claim that it is pre-Pauline and alien must be held as unproven. Cf. Excurses I and II.

a particular relative clause is significantly different in style at a particular linguistic level from the other relative clauses in its epistolary context, is there reason to suppose that it has been shaped by the influence of pre-Pauline formulations?

The Outline of the presentation will be determined by the levels in the linguistic hierarchy at which the evidence occurs. Chapter I will deal with the phrase-level data. It will treat the evidence which concerns the relative clause as a constituent in a substantival phrase (i.e. the relationship between the relative and its antecedent). Chapter II will examine the word-level data. In traditional grammar this is called Accidence and deals with such things as the declension, forms and functions of the various relative words. Chapter III will present the clause-level evidence. It will be primarily concerned with the orders of constituents within the relative clauses themselves. Chapter IV will analyze the use of relative clauses at a sentence level, noting especially those relative clauses that are used adverbially or argumentatively.

Each chapter will have three divisions. Section A will give a detailed presentation of the issues and evidence at the particular linguistic level which results from a study of the Homologoumena. This first section of each chapter will end with a brief summary of the style of the Homologoumena at that level. Section B will give a summary of the evidence in each of the Antilegoumena at the

same level. The style of each Antilegomenon will be presented in the order of the accepted likelihood of authenticity: II Thessalonians, Colossians, Ephesians, I Timothy, II Timothy, Titus. Section C, always denominated as Conclusions, will compare and contrast (a) the Homologoumena with a general overview of the Antilegomena, (b) the Homologoumena with each Antilegomenon, and (c) the Antilegomena with each other in their accepted natural groupings: Colossians-Ephesians and the Pastoral Epistles.

6. The Problem of Tradition Materials

That pre-Pauline materials may be present within the Corpus as relative clauses and that traditional formulae may have shaped some of the Pauline clauses both presents problems for and possibly enhances the value of this study. On the one hand, the question of how the analyzer is to guard against using alien or borrowed materials as a test of authenticity cannot be avoided. On the other hand, the study of such materials is still in its infancy; it has, as yet, given us no criteria which objectively distinguish such materials from their contexts.

The method for treating alleged and possible pre-Pauline formulae and materials throughout this study will be simple and straightforward. (1) Attention will be called to any divergence in the style of those passages which have most frequently been identified as containing liturgical materials (e.g. Philippians 2:6-8; Ephesians 1:3-14; 2:14-18;

Colossians 1:12-14, 15-20; I Timothy 3:16). This will always be done at the linguistic level at which the variance occurs. When this is not done it may be assumed that the alleged traditional formulation agrees in style with the other relative clauses of the epistle in which it occurs at that level. Evidence of a variation from the usual style of the relative clauses of an epistle will not prove that a particular relative clause is a pre-Pauline formula, nor will the absence of such variations disprove it. Hopefully the delineation of such evidence will make a contribution to the discovery of objective criteria for identifying such materials.

(2) Because the study of traditional materials, in the life of the early church is only beginning, it may be possible that this study will make a contribution in another way. At any point in which a given relative clause contrasts with the style of the other relative clauses of that epistle or body of epistles, the differences will be described in detail and parallel forms will be sought in Judaism, the early church and elsewhere. In this way heretofore unidentified traditional materials and formulations may be discovered.

To be able to make a significant contribution in this area would be a significant by-product of this study. Nonetheless, it must be remembered at all times that this dissertation does not seek to determine in any final sense just what relative clauses in the Corpus are pre-Pauline or

shaped by pre-Pauline formulations. The problems in that are complex enough to furnish material and work for several dissertations.

7. Definitions

Several words and phrases which are used technically in the dissertation must be defined before beginning. Whenever the Pauline Corpus or the Corpus is used, the entire body of thirteen epistles is intended, including both the Homologoumena and the Antilegomena. The Homologoumena and the Antilegomena have been defined above.¹⁷ The former will be discussed as a body except when one epistle varies significantly from the others; but the latter will be discussed individually.

Early studies of Greek style, word-order and even authenticity have run into almost insurmountable complexities because they have assumed that the basic unit of meaning in language is a word and that sentences are composed of strings of words. This study is predicated on a different understanding of language; it assumes that each utterance, whether an epistle, a paragraph, a sentence or a clause, is a construction composed of a finite number of constituents of different types which operate at that particular level.¹⁸ Construction is a complete linguistic

¹⁷p. 11.

¹⁸This view of grammar is the result of studies by: Zellig S. Harris, String Analysis of Sentence Structure, Papers in Formal Linguistics, No. 1 (The Hague, 1964); Kenneth L. Pike, Language in Relation to a Unified Theory

unit composed of two or more constituents; sentences, clauses, phrases, and even words (if they contain both a stem and an inflectional suffix) are constructions. A Constituent (which at another linguistic level may also be a construction) is one of the component parts of a construction. Thus a relative clause is a constituent in the noun phrase which contains its antecedent. Nuclear Constituents are those constituents which are obligatory or necessary in a particular construction. In the dissertation the phrase nuclear constituent is primarily used in speaking of constituents which operate at a clause or sentence level. In such cases the nuclear constituents (e.g. predicates, actors, subjects, undergoers, etc.) are usually those constituents, including the verb, whose form is affected by the form of the verb. All other constituents are Non-nuclear Constituents.

With few exceptions grammatical terms will be used in traditional ways throughout. However, those constructions which function as constituents of either sentences or clauses will usually be denominated by functional and descriptive terms, rather than technical and prescriptive terms. For example, throughout the dissertation all types of verbs will be simply designated as verbs. However, whenever it is important to distinguish verb classes

of the Structure of Human Behavior, Rev. ed. (The Hague, 1967); and Robert E. Longacre, Grammar Discovery Procedures, A Field Manual (The Hague, 1964), pp. 12-23.

by function verbs of action will be called predicates. Likewise, verbs of being will be denominated equatives, if the complement (the identifier) is a substantive, and copula, if the complement is an adjective (description) or any other non-substantival construction. Verbs which necessitate an infinitive complement will be called modals. Subjects (used with verbs of being) and actors (used with predicates) are distinguished. Benefactee is used instead of indirect object both because it includes many prepositional phrases equivalent to indirect objects.

8. Symbols and Abbreviations

To facilitate the description and comparison of the relative clauses in the corpus the following symbolic representations will be employed. In discussing the regularity of the presence of certain constituents in particular positions the symbol (+) means that that particular constituent is necessary or Nuclear in that clause type and always appears in the specified position. The symbol ± means the specified constituent is optional and may or may not appear in its normal slot. In relative clauses the relative itself and all nuclear constituents are always necessary (+) constituents.

Each constituent in particular relative clauses will be represented in the following way:

Romans:11:2

ὅν
+UND:r

προέγνω
+PRD:vat

The capital letters designate the constituent and the small letters the type of construction manifesting that constituent. The colon (:) in this case means 'manifested by'. Thus $\delta\upsilon$ is an "undergoer manifested by a relative" and $\pi\rho\omicron\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ is a "predicate manifested by a transitive active verb". The abbreviations which will be used in these symbolic descriptions are found on Tables I and II, which follow.

TABLE I
CONSTITUENT FUNCTION ABBREVIATIONS¹⁹

ACC	Accompaniment	COP	Copula	POS	Possession
ACT	Actor	DES	Description	PRD	Predicate
AGT	Agent	DIR	Direction	PUR	Purpose
ATT	Attribute	EQU	Equative	REF	Referent
BEN	Benefactee	GOL	Goal	REL	Relator
CAU	Cause	IDN	Identification	RES	Result
CMP	Comparison	INS	Instrument	ROL	Role
CPL	Complement	LOC	Location	SOU	Source
CNC	Concession	MAN	Manner	SBJ	Subject
CND	Condition	MOD	Modal	TEM	Time
CON	Connective	NEG	Negative	UND	Undergoer

¹⁹ The actor designates the primary initiator of the action; the agent is the person through whom the actor works in accomplishing his goal. An identification constituent is one that is used to identify another (e.g. the so-called predicate nominatives and appositives); it is often used with an equative. Attributes are often used with copulas and usually describe a substantive by attributing certain properties to it. Connective and relator constituents establish the relations between constituents. They are usually represented by function words often devoid of semantic content. Connectives are used to join equal constructions and relators include such words as prepositions, relatives, subordinating conjunctions and others which relate unequal constituents. N.B. all such connectives will be identified as CON in the following pages to avoid confusion between relator and relative.

Direction, Goal and Purpose are distinguished in the following way: Goal and Purpose imply an act of will, a conscious aiming toward a particular end; Direction implies motion in the direction of an object or location without aim being necessarily implied. Goal is distinct from Purpose in that the former is locative in force while the latter implies the desired result of an action.

TABLE II

CONSTRUCTION TYPE ABBREVIATIONS

adj	Adjective
adv	Adverb
cj	Conjunction
cjpr	Conjunctive Particle
cl	Clause
inf	Infinitive
infph	Infinitive Phrase
mpr	Mood Particle
n	Noun
nph	Noun Phrase
ncl	Noun Clause
ph	Phrase
pph	Prepositional Phrase
npr	Negative Particle
ptc	Participle
ptcph	Participular Phrase
prn	Pronoun
vat	Verb Active Transitive
vi	Verb Intransitive
vad	Verb Active Ditransitive
vpt	Verb Passive Transitive
vpd	Verb Passive Ditransitive
vcp	Verb Copular
vm	Verb Modal

CHAPTER I

THE PAULINE RELATIVE CLAUSES AND THEIR ANTECEDENTS

The relative clause is basically an adjectival clause which may stand in any attributival relationship to a substantival constituent.¹ The first question of an

¹This relationship between antecedent and the relative clause is also manifest by the fact that the relative (or relator) regularly takes the number and gender of the antecedent. The fact that the exceptions in the anticipated form of the relative in particular clauses (i.e. attraction, inverse attraction and *Constructio ad Sensum*) must be explained from this general rule serves to emphasize the adjectival character of the relative clause.

This is worked out most convincingly and explicitly by Kühner-Gerth in an argument worth summarizing. As an adjective the relative clause is closely related to a substantive, a relation on occasion expressed by the fact that an article or demonstrative in the head construction refers to the relative pronoun and vice versa (pp. 400-401). For this reason the ancient grammarians often designated as articles both the definite article and the relative pronoun; the former "article prepositive" and the latter "article postpositive." It is from this fusion of the relative clause with the antecedent, as an adjective is fused with the head, that the assimilation and/or attraction of the cause of the relative to the case of the antecedent occurs. Such attraction is common only when the relative clause has almost completely obtained the value of an attributive adjective or when the relative clause replaces the head construction (pp. 407-408). It is evidently following Kühner-Gerth that Smyth says that when the relative pronoun is attracted to the case of the antecedent, it is equivalent to an attributival adjective. Although logically the relative clause like the adjective follows the word it modified, the order may be inverted when the emphasis is on the relative clause (again like the adjective). This gives the relative an attributival character. If the head construction is rather complex this 'incorporation of the antecedent' may involve part of all of the head construction (pp. 416-419). This close adjectival relationship is often shown by the incorporation of appositives of the head within the relative clause (p. 420). Cf. also the extended discussion of this phenomenon in Bo Heicke, *The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism* (Copenhagen, 1946), pp. 149-172.

author's individual style in employing relative clauses is:

(1) How does he employ adjectival relative clauses: i.e. how often, how consistent, in what patterns and with what kinds of antecedents?

Sometimes the antecedent is omitted and the relative clause itself functions as a substantive in the head construction. In such a case the relative clause is known as a substantival relative clause. At a phrase-level this raises another question about an author's style: (2) How often, in what positions and for what functions does an individual author utilize substantival relative clauses? Are such clauses really substantival or is this just the case of an omitted demonstrative pronoun?

In other cases the relative functions as a demonstrative pronoun and the relative clause as an independent sentence. This usage is often alleged to be the original function of the relative and the relative clause.² In any case, it is an important question of style to determine: (3) What relative clause idioms are actually independent

R. Kühner and B. Gerth, Satzlehre, Vol II: Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache 3rd ed. (Hanover and Leipzig, 1898-1904; reprinted 1955).
Herbert Weir Smyth, Greek Grammar. Gordon M. Messing, ed. (Cambridge, 1963), para. 2524.

² Cf. e.g., Eduard Schwyzler, Griechische Grammatik. Vol 2: Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik. 2nd ed. Handbuch der Altertums wissenschaft. Walter Otto, ed. (Munich, 1959), pp. 640-641; Smyth, op. cit., para. 2490; A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Nashville, 1934), 943.

sentences in a particular corpus and how often and consistent are the patterns of usage there?

Throughout the history of the Greek language, adverbial hypotaxis on a clause level has evolved from relative clause hypotaxis,³ a process which continues in the New Testament. Wherever the relative (usually in conjunction with a preposition) has no antecedent, and serves no substantival function in its own clause, the relative clause functions as an adverb in the sentence in which it occurs. (4) The selection of relative idioms and the frequency of the employment of relatives as adverbial clause connectives in subordinate clauses is also a characteristic of an author's style at a phrase level.

The basic statements above are common to most of the grammatical treatments of relative clauses.⁴ However, a full, descriptive answer to all four questions, detailing frequency, form and function, and variation in patterns constitutes the description of the style of the Homologoumena. As such, it raises the fifth question which must be answered at this level, if a phrase-level analysis of the relative clauses of the Pauline Corpus is to yield evidence on a discussion of the authenticity of particular epistles. That

³Schwyzler, *Op. cit.*, pp. 634-640.

⁴For a survey of the literature on adjectival, substantival, independent, and adverbial relative clauses see notes 5, 16, 30, 33 and 39 respectively below.

is, (5) how do the style patterns of the Homologoumena compare with those of the Antilegomena, both individually and collectively?

A. RELATIVES AND ANTECEDENTS IN THE HOMOLOGOUMENA

At a phrase-level the style of the Homologoumena is quite homogeneous, being characterized by (1) regularity in the linear positions of the various types of relative clauses, (2) the wide attestation of almost every relative clause idiom found in the Homologoumena, (3) the heavy use of substantival relative clauses, and (4) the regular use of other adjectival constructions (in regular patterns) with the antecedents of adjectival relative clauses. The detailed argument for this conclusion follows point by point the questions raised in the introduction.

1. Adjectival Relative Clauses⁵

The 149 adjectival relative clauses, i.e. those

⁵That relative clauses are essentially adjectival clauses and as such require no formal description is assumed by most grammarians. For example, Schwyzler (Op. cit., pp. 640-641) points out that relative clauses became adjectival by the incorporation of the antecedent or head into the relative clause, a process which he says happened when some sentences defined personal or impersonal objects in an appositional way. Smyth, (Op. cit., para. 2488) says that "relative clauses correspond to adjectives (or participles), since like adjectives they serve to define substantives. Like adjectives, too, they often have the value of substantives and stand in any case." He also calls attention to the fact that relative clauses, like adjectives, usually follow the substantive being defined (Ibid., para. 2533. Cf. also George Benedict Winer, A grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament. 7th ed. by Gattlieg Lünemann. J. H. Thayer, tr. (Andover, 1892), p. 167.) F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. 9th ed. Tr. and Rev. by Robert

qualifying expressed antecedents, are proportionately dispersed throughout the Homologoumena, usually coming late in the sentence and almost invariably at the extreme right of the antecedent substantival phrase. The same regularity is found in the antecedents themselves. Antecedent types and functions are also distributed proportionately throughout the Homologoumena.

As an illustration of many of the characteristics of Pauline adjectival relative clauses, Philemon 9-13 is diagrammed below. The antecedent and the relatives are

W. Funk (Chicago, 1961), para. 412-3, calls attention to the fact that relative clauses and attributival participles are equivalent constructions.

By their extensive treatment of matters dealing with the accidentence of the relative words, grammarians seem to assume that they have dealt with the relative clause as an adjective. Usually in such contexts traditional grammarians also discuss definite and indefinite relative clauses, a matter which has nothing to do with whether the relative clause is adjectival or not. Cf. e.g. Nigel Turner, Syntax. Vol III (Edinburgh, 1963), pp. 47, 110; Kühner and Gerth, Op. cit., pp. 399, 426 n. 2; Smyth, Op. cit., para. 2505-9; W.W. Goodwin and B. Gulick, Greek Grammar (Boston, 1930) para. 1026, 1438-40; A.N. Jannaris, An Historical Greek Grammar (London, 1897), para. 2010; W. W. Goodwin, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb (Revised Boston, 1889), pp. 196-198; Ernest De Witt Burton Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek. 3rd ed. (Edinburgh, 1898), para. 269-90.

The basic formal characteristics which distinguish adjectival relative clauses are; (1) they are often related to substantives in the same positions as attributival adjectives and participles (Kühner-Gerth, Op. cit., pp. 400-401; Smyth, Op. cit., para. 2553); (2) the form of the relative itself may occasionally be modified by the form of the antecedent or head; (3) such relative clauses are occasionally coordinate with attributival constructions (Kühner-Gerth, Op. cit., p. 399); (4) such clauses define substantives and often incorporate appositives of the substantive within the clause (Ibid., pp. 416-419).

underlined. While the relative clauses in this sentence are atypical in several ways, they will provide a useful referrent for the discussion which follows.

τοιοῦτος ὢν

ὡς [Παῦλος πρεσβύτης

νυνὶ δὲ καὶ δέσμιος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ,

παρακαλῶ σε περὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ τέκνου

ὃν ἐγέννησα ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς,

ὀνήσιμον,

τὸν [ποτέ σοι ἄχρηστον

νυνὶ δὲ καὶ σοὶ καὶ ἐμοὶ εὐχρηστον,

ὃν ἀνέπεμφά σοι,

αὐτόν, τουτ' ἔστιν τὰ ἐμὰ σπλάγχχνα.

ὃν ἐγὼ ἐβουλόμην

--(ὃν) πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν κατέχειν,

ἵνα ὑπὲρ σοῦ μοι διακονῇ ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς
τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ...

The antecedent of the relative clauses in Philemon 10-13 is τέκνου. This substantive is articular and is governed by the preposition περί, functioning with the preposition as the benefactee in its clause. Τέκνου is qualified or described by a possessive genitive, ἐμοῦ, between the article and the substantive (the preposition), and by three relative clauses, an appositive, an equative clause and a compound articular adjective in the post position. The appositive and the adjectives would normally be in the genitive case, as is the antecedent, however, they have been

attracted to the case of the initial relative pronoun (v. 10).

The Positions of the Adjectival Relative Clauses are highly regularized in the Homologoumena. Relative clauses almost invariably follow the antecedent. In fact, with few exceptions they are found at the extreme end (the linear right) of the noun phrase. One-word attributives, if they are either adjectives or participles, usually precede the antecedent (e.g. I Cor 15:31 τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν). Other attributives of the antecedent, whether genitives (e.g. Rom 1:3 εὐαγγελίου θεοῦ, ὅ...), prepositional phrases (e.g. Rom 1:6 ἔθνεσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ, ἐν οἷς), appositives (e.g. Rom 16:5b Ἐπαίνετον τὸν ἀγαπητὸν μου, ὅς ἐστιν..) and/or participial phrases come (in that order) between the antecedent and the relative clause.⁶ Although any

⁶There are only three exceptions to this general rule:

Phl 3:18-19

πολλοί...
οὓς...ἔλεγον...λέγω
τοὺς ἐχθρούς...
ὧν τὸ τέλος...
ὧν ὁ θεός...
οἱ...φρονούντες.

I Th 1:10

...τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν
ὃν ἡγείρεν ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν
Ἰησοῦν
τὸν ῥυθμιζόμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς... .

Phm 10-13

...τοῦ ἐμοῦ τέκνου
ὃν ἐγέννησά...
ὄνησιμον
τὸν...ἄχρηστον...εὐχρηστον,
ὃν ἀνέπεμψα...,
αὐτόν,
τοῦτ' ἐστὶν τὰ ἐμὰ σπλάγχνα,
ὃν...ἐβουλόμην...κατέχειν... .

attributival construction may and often is compounded,⁷ the Homologoumena provides no examples of the alternating of relative clauses and attributival participles for stylistic effect.⁸ The common Greek practice of putting parts of the main clause between the antecedent and the relative clause occurs only very rarely in these Pauline substantival phrases.⁹

The Frequency and Consistency of the employment of adjectival relative clauses in the Homologoumena is noteworthy. Comparatively speaking, Paul makes limited use of adjectival relative clauses (149/277), an important characteristic of his style, considering that relative clauses are inherently adjectival clauses. Furthermore, these 149 adjectival relative clauses are distributed fairly evenly

All of these exceptions are very similar, indicating a pattern in which the earlier attributives seem to qualify the antecedent and the later ones apparently qualify an appositive to the antecedent. A similar pattern is found in Rom 1:5

...τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ
τοῦ γενομένου...,
τοῦ ὁρισθέντος...,
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν,
ὅτι οὗ ἐλάβομεν... .

⁷ Actually relative clauses, antecedents, and appositives (in descending order) are the most frequently compounded units of these endocentric attributival constructions.

⁸ Several passages which have both adjectival constructions also have more than one of either relative clauses (I Cor 2:7-8; II Cor 1:10) or participial phrases (Rom 1:5).

⁹ A survey of the Homologoumena provides these examples: Rom 1:6, 25 (?); 3:8; 14:15; II Cor 2:4; 3:14; 8:10; 10:2; 11:4b, 4c, 15; Gal 6:16 (relative clause precedes head); Phl 3:18. The phenomenon is more common with pronouns than with nouns.

throughout the major epistles.¹⁰

The Antecedents for Philemon 10-13 and most (124/149) adjectival relative clauses in the Homologoumena¹¹ are substantives, as Table III on the following page demonstrates. Three-fourths (92/124) of these substantival antecedents are articular. About one-half have more than one adjectival construction qualifying the same substantive.¹²

¹⁰54% of the relative clauses in the Homologoumena are adjectival with the range in the major epistles being from 45% in Rom to 65% in Gal. I Th and Phm have too few relative clauses for comparison. The distribution of adjectival relative clauses is as follows: Rom 45; I Cor 36; II Cor 27; Gal 21; Phl 12; I Th 4; Phm 4.

The special epistolary functions of the relative clauses of Phm will be discussed IV, pp. 312-313.

¹¹Only nineteen are pronouns and five are clauses. For detailed evidence for all the statistics on this section, see Appendix I.

While the antecedent in Philemon 10-13 is an articular substantive, antecedents may be anarthrous substantives (εὐαγγελίου...ὁ in Romans 1:3 and Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὁς I Corinthians 1:30), pronouns (ἡμῶν, εἰς οὓς in I Corinthians 10:11), clauses (μονοντῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, ὁ in Galatians 2:10), phrases (τῶν ἀντικειμένων, ἥτις in Philippians 1:28), and statements (cf. e.g. Gal 4:24a where the relative resumes a series of statements).

In at least three, and perhaps five, cases the antecedent of the relative is a clause or sentence. In Galatians 2:10 (a purpose clause), 4:24a (a series of statements), and in Philippians 1:28 (a participial phrase), the antecedent precedes. If the ὅτι clauses in I Corinthians 11:23 and 15:3 are antecedents, and that is questionable, then the antecedent follows the relative clause in those passages. The relatives used to resume the clause vary (Gal 2:10, ὁ; Gal 4:24a, ἕτινα; Phl 1:28, ἥτις; I Cor 11:23, ὁ; I Cor 15:3, ὁ). Otherwise there is nothing peculiar about these adjectival clauses.

¹²In each of these ways the relative clauses and the antecedent in Philemon 10-13 above are typically Pauline.

There is little significant variation in the forms of the antecedents except in Romans and Philemon. In the latter the use of compound attributives and appositives is characteristic of the style of a letter of recommendation

TABLE III
RELATIVE CLAUSES ANTECEDENTS

	Articular Substantive		Anarthrous Substantive		Proper Name			Pronoun		Clause Antecedent	6
	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	1	2		
Rom	6	6	2	4	6	7	6		4		3
I Cor	8	7	5	2	5	1	4		4		
II Cor	3	13	4		5				2		
Gal	7	5	1		2			2	2	2	
Phl		2	1	1	1	1	1	5		1	
I Th	2	1		1							
Phm		1				3			1		
II Th	4	4			1						
Col	15	9		1	1	6		3	1	1	
Eph	6	15	1	4	2	1	2		3	2	
I Tm	6	5	4	5	1		1		1		
II Tm	3	3	2		2	1	1		1		
Tit	3		2	1	1						

1-Rel Cl + Other Attributive
4-Article + Appositive
2-Rel Cl Only Attributive
5-Anarthrous
3-Articular
6-Antecedent Within/After Rel Cl

The Antecedent Functions in the larger construction are theoretically as varied as are the substantival functions in the language. However, it is worth noting that one-half or more of the antecedents in the Homologoumena are nuclear constituents, i.e. those constituents whose form is affected by the form of the verb (in this case actor, subject, identifier, undergoer, and benefactee dative).¹³ The largest group are undergoers. The prepositions which connect the antecedents in phrases to the larger construction are varied and form no patterns of appearance. Dative antecedents governed by ἐν (e.g. I Cor 1:30 ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὅς...) ¹⁴ are slightly more common than others (being more common in

(cf. Ch. IV). Romans 1-6 employs the nomina sacra as antecedents more heavily than the other epistles and relative clauses occur more frequently than usual with the proper names in the extended greeting section of Romans 16. (Cf. the list in Ch. I, pp.). In these two epistles a substantial number of the antecedents have two or more of the following: appositives, participial phrases, or additional relative clauses. (Twelve antecedents with 22 relative clauses. The same twelve antecedents from Rom 1-6, Rom 16 and Phm are also qualified by 2 participial phrases, 13 appositives, and one exegetical equative clause.) Outside of Romans 16 and Philemon the only proper names qualified by a relative clause are nomina sacra except Τιμόθεον in I Corinthians 4:17. The possible significance of these facts for the study of epistolary and liturgical style must be deferred to Chapter IV.

¹³E.g. Actor (II Cor 10:1 ἐγὼ Παῦλος...ὅς); Subject (I Cor 1:9 ὁ θεὸς δὲ... οὐ...); Identifier (Gal 5:21 πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία,..., ἅ...); Undergoer (Phm 5 τὴν πίστιν ἣν...); Benefactee (Rom 16:27 μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ...ᾧ...).

¹⁴Cf. also Rom 3:25; II Cor 4:4a; Phl 2:26; etc.

the language in this period), but are not concentrated in any particular epistle or passage. Genitival antecedents without prepositions (e.g. Gal 1:5 τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, ᾧ ...) ¹⁵ are common (datives without prepositions are not and are limited to benefactive constituents) and are spread proportionately throughout the Homologoumena. Table IV on the following page and Excursus II summarize and detail this information by epistle and category.

2. Substantival Relative Clauses

Substantival relative clauses are those clauses (1) which have no expressed antecedent and (2) which fill a substantival slot in the head construction or clause. ¹⁶ The Pauline examples of these clauses fall into two functionally and formally distinct groups. Those relative clauses which are resumed by the demonstrative οὗτος and its equivalents in a succeeding head clause are also substantival relative clauses. The frequency with which Paul utilized substantival

¹⁵Cf. also Rom 2:6; I Cor 10:11; Phl 3:8, among others.

¹⁶Because most Greek grammarians work with prescriptive rather than descriptive categories, they usually treat substantival relative clauses as a type of adjectival relative clause. Cf. e.g. Kühner-Gerth, *Op. cit.*, pp. 400-403; K. Brugmann, *Greek Grammar*, 4th ed., Ed. by A. Thumb (Munich, 1913) p. 23; Smyth, *Op. cit.*, paras. 2488, 2509, 2518 and elsewhere; Goodwin-Gulick, *Op. cit.*, para. 1026-29; Robertson, *Op. cit.*, pp. 719-721.

It is probably for this reason that Walter Bauer (*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 4th ed. Tr. and Rev. by William R. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. (Chicago, 1957) p. 587) and Winer (*Op. cit.*, p. 158), as well as Smyth (*Op. cit.*, para. 2509, 2518, 2522) speak of the omission of the demonstrative οὗτος whenever the head clause contains neither an antecedent nor a resuming demonstrative.

TABLE IV
ANTECEDENT CONSTITUENT FUNCTIONS

	NUCLEAR					NON-NU		NON-NUCLEAR with PREPOSITIONS											TOTAL NON-NUCLEAR			
	Actor	Subject	Ident- ifier	Under- lier	Benefac- tee	NUCLEAR TOTALS	Dative	Genitive	els + acc	repl + gen	rad + acc	ev + dat	old + acc	old + gen	unep + gen	entl + acc	entl + dat	ex + gen	rad + acc	mpog + acc	Others	TOTAL NON-NUCLEAR
Rom	2	5	1	16	1	25		5	2	2	2	2	1	2	4	2					1	18
I Cor	4	10	1	17	1	23		3			1	3										4
II Cor	2	1		10	1	14		3	1	1		2		1			3	2	1			11
Gal	2	3	1	4	1	11		2	1				2			1				1	1	6
Phl	3			3	2	8		1				2										2
I Th				2		2										1						1
Phm				1		1				3												3
II Th		2		36	1	39		1				1							1			2
Col	4		1	9	2	16		7				4	1		2				1	2		10
Eph	2	3	1	6	1	13		3	1			7	1	2			1		3	1		16
I Tm	3	2		6		11		3	1	1		1					1	1	1	2		8
II Tm	4			3	2	9		3						1			1					2
Tit		2				2		3				1						1				2

relative clauses and the regularity of the Pauline substantival clause patterns make these clauses the single most striking phrase-level characteristic of the relative clauses of the Homologoumena.

The Frequency of substantival relative clauses in the Homologoumena is especially noteworthy. A full forty-two per cent (115) of the relative clauses of these epistles are substantival. These are distributed proportionately throughout the accepted epistles with only I Thessalonians completely lacking any examples.¹⁷

Type I of the Pauline substantival relative clauses is a sub-group of substantival relative clauses which are distinct in both form and function and which mark one clear aspect of the distinctiveness of Pauline style. Among the examples of this type are:

Romans 2:23

ὃς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι,

διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τὸν θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις;

and in Romans 6:2

οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ,

πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ;

All of the relative clauses resumed by the demonstrative οὗτος in a succeeding head clauses are also substantival

¹⁷Rom, 48; I Cor, 24; II Cor, 16; Gal, 12; Phl, 13; Phm, 1. All of the substantival relative clauses in the Pauline Corpus are listed and classified according to substantival functions in Appendix III.

clauses of Type I.¹⁸

Substantival relative clauses of Type I manifest several distinct peculiarities in the Homologoumena.

(1) As in the two examples above, they normally precede the main clause.¹⁹ According to Behaghel's Law,²⁰ the heavier or longer constituents come later in Greek sentences, a rule which normally assigns relative clauses to position near the end of their sentences. This infraction of Behaghel's Law of Type I of the substantival relative clauses is the most consistent and extensive one to be found in Pauline relative sentences. It is a remarkable stylistic trait.

(2) Type I includes those relative clauses which function as subjects, identifiers, actors, undergoers, benefactees, and referents (i.e. the nuclear constituents), plus those relative clauses which function as possessors. These are, of course, the substantival functions which are

¹⁸ Cf. I, pp. 42-43.

¹⁹ The exceptions are (1) certain interrogative sentences containing relative clauses (Rom 10:14a, 14b; II Cor 12:13), and (2) relative clause in imperative sentences (I Cor 10:15; 16:2; Phl 2:5) Rom 8:28 (interrogative) and Phl 3:6 (imperative) have preceding substantival relative clauses. Gal 5:4 is the only example of a substantival relative clause which both follows the head construction and does not fit one of the two categories above.

²⁰ The shorter or lighter constituents come early and longer or heavier constituents come later in Greek sentences is a rule-of-thumb that every beginning Greek student learns. In this study this observation is called Behaghel's Law. Cf. III, pp. 208-209 and III, n. 5 for a fuller discussion both of the history of this rule and of its application in the Pauline relative clauses.

normally manifested by word-level constructions (as opposed to prepositional phrases).

(3) The relative clause and the head clause are often related in other ways besides relative-antecedent syntax. For example, in substantival relative clauses the relative often has the same case in its own clause as the substantival function of the relative clause would demand and, indeed, it often serves that same function in its own clause (Cf. e.g. Rom 2:23 and 6:2 above). Many utilize the same verb in both the main and the relative clauses (e.g. Rom 6:10b ὁ δὲ ζῇ, ζῇ τῷ θεῷ).²¹ The predicate of the relative clause is often anterior in time to the predicate of the main clause. Among the idioms which manifest this phenomenon are contrasting predicates of wishing - doing (e.g. Rom 7:16 ὁ οὐ θέλω τοῦτο πράσσω), promising-- doing (e.g. Rom 4:21 ὁ ἐπ' ἡγγελται δυνατός ἐστιν καὶ ποιῇσαι), and seeking - obtaining (e.g. Rom 11:7 ὁ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραὴλ, τοῦτο οὐχ ἐπέτυχεν) or by contrasts in the tense and/or mood of the verb.²² In a substantial majority of the substantival relative clauses the predicate or verb is the final word-level constituent in

²¹Clauses which use the same verb in both the relative clause and the main clause are denoted by an apostrophe (') in **Appendix III**.

²²Cf. e.g. Rom 6:2 above. Other examples of these phenomena are noted by an asterisk (*) in **Appendix III**.

both the relative and the main clauses.²³ All of the substantival relative clauses of Type I manifest a clear relationship between form and function.

Those peculiarities have nothing to do with the substantival function of the clause as such, but serve to characterize the style of the author. They will also be significant in the discussion of argumentative uses of relative clauses in Chapter IV.

Type II of the substantival relative clauses include those substantival relative clauses which are utilized to express source, location, instrument, comparison, cause, and time.²⁴ Two typical examples of Type II are:

I Corinthians 10:13b

...οὐκ ἔάσει ὑμᾶς πειρασθῆναι,
ὅτι ὁ δύνανται;

II Corinthians 2:3

ἵνα μὴ ἐλθὼν λύπην σχῶ
ἀφ' ὧν ἔδει με χαίρειν,...

Substantival relative clauses of Type II also have several distinguishing traits (1) They seldom introduce

²³ Many of these are accounted for by two facts: (1) Many are two member clauses; (2) Many have a common predicate. This would lead us to expect other constituents in these clauses to be emphasized. See the material on constituent order in Chapter III.

²⁴ Substantival functions ^{are} usually manifested at a phrase level or by adverbs.

a sentence and regularly are found near the end of the sentence (as one would expect according to Behaghel's law).²⁵

(2) They are usually phrase level structures since the function is normally designated by a preposition. (3) The substantival functions are invariably adverbial. These clauses differ from the adjective clauses which also come near the end and frequently have prepositional connective in this way: the substantival clauses have no antecedent.

The Functions of Substantival Relative Clauses²⁶

Of the 115 substantival relative clauses in the Homologoumena, seventy-six are used as nuclear constituents.²⁷ Thirty-nine are used, with or without prepositional connectives, as non-nuclear and adverbial constituents of the larger construction.²⁸ With the exception of I Thessalonians and

²⁵Precede head clause: Rom 11:13; I Cor 7:1; II Cor 11:21; Gal 4:1; Phm 21 (undergoer). Within head clause: Rom 8:3; II Cor 12:17.

²⁶Appendix III classifies all the substantival relative clauses according to function. It subdivides the substantival clauses serving non-nuclear functions because this arrangement will be important in Chapter IV.

²⁷Actors, 10 (e.g. Rom 2:23 ὃς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶται, ... τοῦ νόμου... ἀτιμάζεις;); Undergoers, 54 (e.g. I Cor 7:36 ὃ θέλει ποιῶ;); Subjects, 7 (e.g. Rom 14:21 καλὸν τὸ... μὴδὲ ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀδελφός σου προσκοπτεῖ); Identifiers, 3 (e.g. II Cor 4:6 ὅτι ὁ θεός... ὃς ἔλαμψεν...); Benefactees w/o prepositions, 2 (e.g. I Cor 7:39 ᾧ θέλει γαμηθῆναι).

²⁸E.g. POS: Rom 6:16b ... δοῦλοὶ ἐστε ᾧ ὑπακούετε...; SOU: II Cor 12:17 μὴ τινα ὧν ἀπέσταλκα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, δι' αὐτοῦ ἐπλεονέκτησα ὑμᾶς; LOC: Phl 4:11 ... ἐν οἷς εἰμι αὐτάρκης εἶναι; INS: Rom 2:1 ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίνεις τὸν ἕτερον, σεαυτὸν κατακρίνεις; CMP: II Cor 1:13 οὐ γὰρ γράφομεν ὑμῖν ἄλλ' ἢ ἃ ἀναγινώσκετε...; CAU: II Cor 11:21 ἐν ᾧ δ' ἂν τις τολμᾷ... τολμᾷ καὶ γὰρ REF: Gal 1:20 ἃ δὲ γράφω ὑμῖν... οὐ ψεύδομαι.

Philemon, each of which have too few relative clauses to be useful comparatively, the epistles of the Homologoumena have only slight variations in the distribution of both the substantival relative clauses, and the substantival functions, as well as in the idioms used to express the adverbial functions.

Substantival Relative Clauses Resumed by Demonstratives

Twenty-eight of the substantival relative clauses are resumed by a form of οὗτος in the main clause.²⁹ An example of this construction is found in Romans 7:15b: οὗ γὰρ ὃ θέλω τοῦτο πράσσω.

Although grammarians have usually treated such clauses as adjectival,³⁰ several factors make it clear that

²⁹Rom 2:15; 7:15b; 15c, 16, 19b, 20; 8:15, 30a, 30b; 11:7; 1 Cor 7:24; 12:23; 16:3; Gal 2:18; 5:17; 6:7, 12; Phl 2:5; 3:7; 4:8a, 8b, 8c, 8d, 8e, 8f, 9. In the total number is included Phl 3:6 (τῷ αὐτῷ). This construction is parallel in every way to clauses containing forms of τοῦτο after the relative clauses and is in no way parallel to attributive relative clauses.

³⁰Grammarians, working partially from the assumption that all relative clauses are adjectival and partially from analogy to other Western languages, assume that substantival relative clauses are actually adjectival relative clauses which refer to an omitted demonstrative. In that case those clauses would be a sub-class of the relative clauses which are resumed by demonstratives.

Among the possible examples of such a view one can cite: Bauer, Op. cit., p. 587; Winer, Op. cit., p. 158, says the demonstratives to which the relatives can refer are lacking, while warning that these are not cases of the proper elipsis of the demonstrative pronoun. Smyth assumes the presence of the demonstrative to be the regular practice and speaks regularly of the omission of it in certain cases. Smyth (Op. cit., para. 2509, 2518, 2522) and Winer (pp. 158, 543) also refer to this circumstance as an omission.

Goodwin-Gulick (Op. cit., para. 1027, 1029) rightly

these are actually substantival relative clauses: (1) They precede the head clauses in all cases except two.³¹ (2) The most intensive use of this idiom is made in Romans 7:15-20 and 8:30,³² passages in which the demonstrative is clearly used for emphasis. (3) In all other ways these relative clauses manifest the same tendencies as the substantival relative clauses. (4) The demonstrative follows the relative clause immediately in all cases except I Corinthians 7:24 and 16:3. It is worth noting that this idiom does not occur in II Corinthians, I Thessalonians, and Philemon.

3. Independent Relative Clauses³³

The only clearly independent relative clauses in

in my judgment, warn against speaking of the omission of the demonstrative pronoun. These grammarians state instead that often when a relative with an omitted antecedent precedes the head clause, the head clause often has a demonstrative referring back with emphasis to the omitted antecedent.

³¹Rom 2:15; Phl 2:5.

³²In each passage the first of a series of substantival relative clauses is not resumed by the demonstrative; only the succeeding and contrasting clauses are. This indicates that the demonstrative is used for emphasis only.

³³The major Greek grammarians of the last century disagree on whether the relative clause was originally an independent construction. Robertson (*Op. cit.*, p. 953) and Schwyzer (*Op. cit.*, pp. 640 and 640, n. 1) argue that it was, with the relative word being simply a substantive or an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun. Alexander Buttmann, *A Grammar of the New Testament Greek* J. H. Thayer, Tr. (Andover, 1873), p. 282 on the other hand, insists that "relative clauses are naturally and originally subordinate or secondary clauses, and hence strictly ought always to append only subordinate thoughts immediately dependent of the leading clause, or adjuncts of individual members of it." Brugmann (*Op. cit.*, p. 122) takes a different position on the questions. He says:

The stem (Indoger *io*) was originally an anaphoric pronoun perhaps with the meaning of our

the Homologoumena are the antithetical clauses, i.e.

"He" and by being declinable in all genders and cases, it pointed to a preceding noun idea or occasionally to a whole preceding clause when the relative was in the neuter. Already in the pre-history of the Greek Language, all sentences beginning with forms of the relative were subordinated and never again appear in main clauses. The same is also true of - adverbs which either take up a particular part of a preceding clause or else combined as a unit the whole content of the clause (underlining added).

But whatever may have been the history of the speech idiom, there is general agreement among scholars (Brugmann excepted) that in the New Testament period some relative clauses were simply the equivalents of coordinate sentences. Buttmann regarded this as being due to the influence of Latin and he comments that it more common in writers who wrote in literary Greek. Buttmann, *Op. cit.*, p. 282; Jannaris, *Op. cit.*, p. 404; L. Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*. Vol I. Part I of *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Ed. by Hans Lietzmann. (Tübingen, 1912), p. 177; Kühner-Gerth, *Op. cit.*, p. 434; Edwin Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* 2nd ed., 3rd rev. (1936), p. 77. Smyth (*Op. cit.*, para. 2490-91) and Winer (*Op. cit.*, p. 542) among others advocate the identification of some relative clauses as independent sentences in the New Testament period. Blass-Debrunner (*Op. cit.*, para. 458) will not go this far, but does recognize relative clauses which are "something intermediate between a relative clause and a demonstrative clause."

Greek scholarship generally has not been very instructive on the formal means by which one distinguished coordinate relative clauses from the subordinated ones. Although no one else says the same thing explicitly, Buttmann probably speaks for the consensus when he says:

But the influence of Latin upon the late Greek language is unmistakable, in the fact that relative clauses so often stand in Latin style quite at the beginning of a sentence, or serve as a continuation of the leading clause; yet in such a way that in both cases they contain leading thought, and thus, assume the relation of co-ordinate leading clause....(Buttmann, *Op. cit.*, p. 282).

In any case there seems to be a general assumption that the reader knows intuitively which relative clauses are co-ordinate, i.e. that he can discern leading thoughts from other thoughts.

successive clauses introduced by $\delta\varsigma$ μέν and $\delta\varsigma$ δέ (or equivalents).³⁴ An example of this construction is found in

The most commonly mentioned characteristic of the so-called co-ordinate relative clauses is the presence of καί immediately after the relative pronoun. Buttmann, (Op. cit., p. 282) says:

A portion of these clauses still evince their characteristic as subjoined leading clauses by inserting immediately after the relative the additional connective καί (just as in the German sentence--was er sach that).

Jannaris (Op. cit., para. 1718) agrees, tracing this practice literary Greek to the influence of *qui et* in Latin. Radermacher (Op. cit., p. 177) thinks the idiom is older than the Graeco-Roman period but says that the relative followed immediately by καί does introduce an independent sentence. Smyth (Op. cit., para. 2490) notes that other connectives subjoined immediately to the relative may also indicate that the relative clause is an independent sentence. He mentions καί, ἀλλά, δέ, ὅν, οὖν, and ἄρα. This same list is given by Kühner-Gerth (Op. cit., p. 434).

Winer and Kühner-Gerth approach the matter by discussing the circumstances under which Greek authors use relative clauses to express independent sentences. Winer notes three situations when this occurs: (1) when the relative clause is of an appositive nature; (2) "when a discourse, particularly a narration is continued by $\delta\varsigma$... and that is resolvable into καί οὗτος; and (3) when the Subject or Predicate is a relative clause" (Winer, Op. cit., pp. 542-3). Kühner-Gerth notes that among other places Greek employs this construction: (1) in both poetic and prosal causal sentences; (2) when the speech has been interrupted by one or more clauses; (3) primarily by poets in addresses and questions; (4) in combination with the cohortative subjunctive, the optative or wishes, the imperative, and the prohibitive subjunctive; and (5) in clauses which have the value of an independent clause according to logical content (Kühner-Gerth, Op. cit., p. 435).

³⁴Antithetical relative clauses are set off from the other relative clauses of the Homologoumena by certain peculiar characteristics: (1) They usually appear in groups or lists of two more relative clauses. The first begins with some form of $\delta\varsigma$ μέν..., the second with $\delta\varsigma$ δέ... (or ἄλλος δέ... or ἕτερος δέ...). (2) The usual laws of concord and agreement between relative and antecedent do not apply. (3) Often the initial relative clause and main clause are connected by a coordinating connective. (4) They constitute the only relative clauses in the Homologoumena which function clearly as independent sentences.

Romans 14:5:

ὃς μὲν γὰρ κρίνει ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν,

ὃς δὲ κρίνει πᾶσαν ἡμέραν·

ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοῦ πληροφoρεῖσθω.

There are eleven clauses introduced by ὃς μὲν or ὃς δέ in the Homologoumena.³⁵ At least seven, and perhaps nine, of them are independent.³⁶

There are several traits which indicate that these relative clauses are independent sentences: (1) They are often connected to the preceding clause by the coordinating connectives καί (I Cor 11:21b, 21c; 12:28), δέ (I Cor 12:8) or γὰρ (Rom 14:5a, 5b; I Cor 12:8) instead of by the relative itself. They may occur in what is clearly a coordinate relationship (Rom 14:2; II Cor 2:16a, 16b).³⁷ (2) On occasion the antecedent is absent and yet the relative clause does not function substantivally in the main clause (Rom 14:2; I Cor 12:28). (3) Sometimes there is no antecedent or else the word which refers to relative clause

³⁵Blass-Debrunner (Op. cit., para. 250) also includes I Cor 7:7 (bis) and Phil 1:16-17 (bis). However, the definite article is better attested in each passage. Rom 4:11, I Cor 12:28 and Eph 4:11 demonstrate the use of the definite article to state alternatives also.

³⁶Clearly independent: Rom 14:2, 5a, 5b; I Cor 11:21a, 21b; 12:8, 28. Probably independent: II Cor 2:16a, 16b.

³⁷The two clauses in II Cor 2:16 parallel the preceding ὅτι clause. The first relative resumes τοῖς σωζομένοις and the second τοῖς ἀπολλύμενοις. Ὁσμή in each parallel to εὐωδία and an equitative first person plural predicate is assumed in each.

must be singular while the relative construction demands a plural (Rom 14:5a, 5b; I Cor 11:21a, 21b; 12:8), thus breaking the rules of agreement.

4. Adverbial Relative Clauses

Adverbial relative clauses are those relative clauses in which (1) the relative (usually in conjunction with a preposition) has no antecedent³⁸ and (2) in which the relative has no substantival function in its own clause.³⁹ As such they represent a developing idiom in the continuing evolution of the Greek language. Paul's use of adverbial relative clauses is limited and distinctive, but the various idioms have wide attestation.⁴⁰

There are thirteen adverbial relative clauses in the Homologoumena, all of which function either as causal⁴¹

³⁸For this reason they have all been included in Type II of the substantival relative clauses above. This is linguistically justifiable because adverbs are equivalent to certain functions of the oblique cases of substantives.

³⁹The adverbial relative clause is a question of form, i.e. the choice and arrangement of particular relative and relative clause idioms. Adverbial relative clauses are to be distinguished from the adverbial use of relative clauses. This latter category is a matter of the logical function of the relative clause in the larger construction in which that clause occurs (cf. Chap. IV, pp. 313-330). Adverbial relative clauses are a distinctive sub-group within the larger category of relative clauses used adverbially.

⁴⁰Although Rom contains a larger proportion of the adverbial relative clauses than any other epistle, examples of each kind (temporal and causal) are found in each of the major epistles. Furthermore, those idioms that occur more than once usually occur in more than one epistle also.

⁴¹Rom 5:12; 8:3; II Cor 5:4; Phl 3:12.

or temporal⁴² adverbs. The causal clauses are introduced either by ἐν ᾧ as in

Romans 8:3

τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου,

ἐν ᾧ ἡσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός, κτλ.

or ἐφ' ᾧ as in

Philippians 3:12

διώκω δὲ εἰ καὶ καταλάβω,

ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ κατελήμφην ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.⁴³

Four different idioms introduce temporal adverbial relative clauses. They are ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ as in

Romans 2:16

καὶ μεταξύ ἀλλήλων... [κατηγορούντων
ἢ καὶ ἀπολογουμένων,

ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ κρίνει ὁ θεὸς τὰ κρυπτὰ κτλ.

ἐφ' ὅσον as in

Romans 11:13

ἐφ' ὅσον μὲν οὖν εἰμι ἐγὼ ἔθνων ἀπόστολος,

τὴν διακονίαν μου δοξάζω,

and the related ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον as in

Galatians 4:1

ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ὁ κληρονόμος νηπιὸς ἐστίν,

οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου...⁴⁴

⁴²Rom 2:16; 7:1; 11:13, 25; I Cor 7:39; 11:26; 15:25; Gal 4:1, 19b.

⁴³Cf. also Rom 5:12 and II Cor 5:4.

⁴⁴Cf. also Rom 7:1; I Cor 7:39.

ἄχρι οὗ as in

I Corinthians 11:26

τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε,

ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ;⁴⁵

and μέχρις οὗ as in

Galatians 4:19b

οὗς πάλιν ὠδίνω

μέχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν.

5. Summary

At the beginning of this chapter four questions were posited which, if answered, would result in a description of the phrase-level style of the Homologoumena. As the study has proceeded direct and unambiguous answers to these questions have emerged and the dominant and quite consistent patterns which characterize that style have become clear.

(1) The adjectival clauses, i.e. those qualifying expressed antecedents usually come late in the sentence and almost invariably are found near the extreme right of the noun phrase of the antecedent. Seldom, unless the antecedent is a pronoun, does any other constituent, except parts of the antecedent phrase, come between the relative clause and the antecedent.

Most antecedents are nouns (twenty-four are pronouns and five are clauses). Three-fourths are articular and more than half have at least one other adjectival

⁴⁵Cf. also Rom 11:25; I Cor 15:25.

constituent qualifying the antecedent besides the relative clause. Single-word, genitival, appositival, and participial modifiers of the antecedent show great regularity of linear distributions in relation to the antecedent. The antecedent may serve any substantival function in its own clause; the largest single block (53) are undergoers.

(2) The Pauline Homologoumena make heavy and consistent use of substantival relative clauses. The adjectival/substantival clause ratio is 5/4. In those epistles which have enough relative clauses to compare the range is between 5/5 and 7/4. Also the positions of the substantival clauses in the main clause have consistent patterns of linear distribution. Substantival clauses functioning as nuclear constituents (and therefore without prepositional connectives) almost invariably introduce the main clause (Type I); those serving non-nuclear and often adverbially functions (usually indicated by an introductory preposition) come late in the larger construction (Type II). The prepositional connectives (or function indicators) of Type II are often widely attested in the Homologoumena.

Internally the substantival clauses show several peculiar style traits. They are often short, i.e. clauses of two or three constituents. A dozen utilize the same predicate as the main clause. The predicates of the substantival relative clauses are often temporally anterior to the main verb. Sometimes substantival clauses are resumed by a οὗτος in the following main clause.

(3) All the independent relative clauses in the Homologoumena are antithetical relative clauses (i.e. introduced by $\delta\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ and $\delta\varsigma \delta\acute{\epsilon}...$) and most of the antithetical clauses in these epistles (9/11) may be independent. The reasons for classifying these sentences as independent are coordination, lack of expressed subordination, and absence of substantival function.

(4) Adverbial relative clauses are used infrequently (13x) in the Homologoumena. All of the relative idioms which connect such clauses to the preceding head clause are introduced by prepositions. This usage is limited to temporal and causal clauses. Adverbial relative clauses, although present more frequently in Romans, are found in all the major epistles.

B. RELATIVES AND ANTECEDENTS IN THE ANTILEGOMA

In order for a phrase-level analysis of the style of the relative clauses of the Homologoumena to be useful in discussing the authenticity of any of the Antilegomena, it is necessary that a fifth question be asked: How do the style patterns of the Antilegomena, collectively and individually, compare with those of the Homologoumena. Again it is possible to give more definite answers to this question than one might assume.

1. General Contrasts

At a phrase-level the Antilegoma, both collectively and individually, and both in general and in specifics, contrasts with the style of the Homologoumena. Among the more

general observations are: (1) none of the Antilegomena falls within the range of the Homologoumena on the proportion of substantival relative clauses; (2) none shows an identical regularity of relationships, linear and otherwise, between relative clause and antecedent; (3) the substantival relative clauses of Type II in the Homologoumena generally contrast in the construction idioms from the same in the Antilegomena; (4) the independent relative clauses of the two groups are, with the exception of II Timothy 2:20, mutually exclusive.

With reference to the more specific observations, the statement of style of each epistle of the Antilegomena makes quite clear the marked differences between the style of that epistle and the style of the Homologoumena. In summary, we should note each of the Antilegomena contains relative clause idioms that are not found in the Homologoumena and that often contrast with equivalent idioms in the accepted epistles. The only relative clause introduced by $\delta\upsilon\theta' \tilde{\omega}\nu$ is a causal clause in II Thessalonians 2:10, a construction which contrasts with the usual Pauline $\epsilon\varphi' \tilde{\omega}$ (Rom 8:12; II Cor 5:4; Phl 3:12) or $\epsilon\nu \tilde{\omega}$ (Rom 8:3). The two independent relative clauses in this epistle (1:11; 2:14), both introduced with $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tilde{\theta}$ contrast both to the Pauline equivalent $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omicron$ (Rom 14:29; II Cor 2:9) and to a similar $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tilde{\theta}$ in Colossians 1:29.⁴⁶ The $\tilde{\theta} \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ of Colossians and

⁴⁶ $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tilde{\theta}$ in II Th resumes to a telic construction following and subordinate to the relative clause. In Col 1:29 $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tilde{\theta}$ resumes a preceding $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$ clause.

Ephesians contrasts with $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ in the Homologoumena. The clause of Colossians 2:1 is markedly different from the rather stereotyped forms of the Homologoumena. The temporal relative clauses of Colossians 1:6, 9 also contrast to the usual Pauline idiom. The $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\ \delta$ clause of Colossians 1:29 is unique in the Corpus and contrasts to the usual Pauline idiom. The absence of any substantial and parallel adjectival clause-level construction is found only in Ephesians and II Timothy. The loose constructions with antecedents governed by prepositions is unique to Ephesians. The substantival clause in I Timothy 2:10 is unique and contrasts to the usual Pauline idiom in Romans 2:1; 14:22. The $\delta\nu\ \tau\rho\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu$ clause of II Timothy 3:14 is unique and clauses introduced $\delta\epsilon\ \eta\nu\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu$ are found in our corpus only in II Timothy and Titus, contrasting with the $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ constructions which are common in the Homologoumena.

Furthermore, each of the Antilegomena contrast both with each other and with the Homologoumena on the employment of the relative clause idioms of the Homologoumena. The proportion of substantival relative clauses varies all the way from II Timothy which is within the range of the Homologoumena by of II Thessalonians, Titus, Colossians and I Timothy to Ephesians, which has none. None of them regularly put substantival clauses of Type I before the head clause.

Three-quarters of the antecedents of adjectival clauses are articular in the Homologoumena and a majority

are qualified by some other appositives or adjectival constructions. In most cases the adjectival relative clause follows the antecedent. All of the antecedents in II Thessalonians are articular but only one (2:8-10) has more than one appositive or clause-level adjective. In Colossians every substantive antecedent is articular and two-thirds of the antecedents have multiple clause-level adjectival constituents. All nomina sacra and proper names qualified by relative clauses in Colossians also are qualified by appositives. Ephesians never has an adjectival relative clause before its antecedents, usually placing the relative clause immediately after the antecedent. Relative clauses in this epistle seldom resume nomina sacra or proper names. In only one case does the relative resume an antecedent which is also identified by another relative clause or attributival participle. About two-thirds of the antecedents are articular in Ephesians. Almost half of the antecedents in I Timothy are anarthrous and only one is a proper name. Most of the antecedents have no appositives and/or participial phrases parallel to the relative clause. Only one of the antecedents in II Timothy is qualified by an appositive, participle or second relative clause. The same is also true in Titus with the exceptions of the appositive in 2:13 (Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ) and the possible parallel relative clauses in 1:11.

2. II Thessalonians

Although II Thessalonians has almost too few relative clauses for comparison, it has more than its share

of unusual phenomena. Nine of the thirteen relative clauses (69%) are adjectival. Each of these nine have articular substantives as antecedents. Six of the antecedents are employed as undergoers. These proportions are higher than the averages in the Homologoumena.

II Thessalonians has two substantival and two independent relative clauses. The substantival clause in 3:4⁴⁷ fits the usual pattern of Type I in the Homologoumena. The other is a Type II substantival relative clause introduced by ἀνθ' ὧν used as a causal connective (2:10).⁴⁸ This idiom is not found in the Homologoumena; in fact, the equivalent there is ἐφ' ᾧ (Rom 5:12; II Cor 5:4; Phl 3:12) or ἐν ᾧ (Rom 8:3).

The two independent relative clauses in this epistle are completely different from any found in the Homologoumena (1:11; 2:14).⁴⁹ Both clauses are introduced by εἰς ὅ. In the former the antecedent is a ἵνα clause following the relative clause and specifying the content of the prayer. The antecedent of the latter is the phrase εἰς περιποίησιν δόξης τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ coming at

⁴⁷ Ἄ παραγγέλλομεν ποιεῖτε καὶ ποιήσετε.

⁴⁸ ...ἐστὶν ἡ παρουσία κατ' ἐνεργεῖαν τοῦ σατανᾶ... τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἀνθ' ὧν τὴν ἀγαπὴν τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἐδέξαντο....

⁴⁹ 1:11 εἰς ὃ καὶ προσευχόμεθα πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν ἵνα ὑμᾶς ἀξιώσῃ....
2:14 εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὑμᾶς.. εἰς περιποίησιν δόξης....

the end of the relative clause. Not only are these two clauses not antithetical sentences, as are all the Pauline independent relative clauses, but they contrast with their equivalent in the Homologoumena, i.e. the sentences introduced by εἰς τοῦτο (Rom 14:29; II Cor 2:9).

3. Colossians

In contrast to the style of most of the Homologoumena, the basic style of Colossians may be characterized as appositional or adjectival. The utilization of relative clauses by the author of this epistle is consistent with and characteristic of that fact, and as such, contrasts markedly with the relative clause style of the Homologoumena.⁵⁰

This epistle not only contains an unusually large number of relative clauses (43), but it is distinguished by the very high ratio of adjectival relative clauses (37/43). Thirty-two of the antecedents are substantives and all of these, but one, are articular. Two-thirds of the adjectival relative clauses (25/37) qualify antecedents having one or more additional adjectival modifiers. The epistle shows

⁵⁰Important studies of the style of Colossians are found in Ernst Percy, Die Probleme der Kolosser--und Epheserbriefe (Lund, 1946), pp. 16-66, and in Eduard Lohse, Colossians and Philemon, William R. Pohlmann and Robert J. Karris, trans. (Philadelphia, 1971), pp. 84-91. However, neither of these two valuable studies have made clear the basic appositional character of the style of this epistle, nor have they grasped precisely the contrast between the style of this epistle and Ephesians. A full description of the characteristic style of Colossians and of the place of relative clauses in that style is found in Excursus I: The Style of Colossians and Its Relative Clauses.

a marked propensity for piling up participial phrases, appositives, and relative clauses.⁵¹ One of many examples of this is found in:

Colossians 1:7

...Ἐπαφρᾶ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ συνδούλου ἡμῶν,

ὃς ἐστὶν πιστὸς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διάκονος τοῦ Χριστοῦ,

ὃ καὶ δηλώσας ἡμῖν τὴν ἀγάπην ἐν πνεύματι.

All the proper names and nomina sacra qualified by relative clauses also have appositives. Parallels to such stylistic traits can be found at scattered places in the Homologoumena (esp. Rom 1-6; 16 and Philemon), but never with this frequency.

Related to the appositional character of the style of this epistle, an unusually large number (13/32) resume genitival antecedents.⁵² Similarly related is the use of the explanatory or exegetical relative clause introduced by ὃ ἐστὶν (ἥτις ἐστίν). In our corpus this construction is found only in Colossians and Ephesians.⁵³ The equivalent of this construction in the Homologoumena is τοῦτ' ἐστίν.⁵⁴

⁵¹Cf. e.g. 1:7, 14-16, 23, 24-25, 27b-28; 3:6-7; 4:8, 9, 10a, 10b.

⁵²1:6, 7, 9, 14, 15, 18, 23a, 23b, 24, 25, 27; 2:3.

⁵³Col 1:24, 27; 2:10, 17; 3:5, 14. Eph 1:14; 3:13; 6:2(?).

⁵⁴Rom 1:12; 7:18; 9:8; 10:6, 7, 8; Phm 12.

Colossians contains seven substantival relative clauses, a smaller ratio than any of the major epistles of the Homologoumena. Two clauses of Type I introduce the main clause (both with εἰς);⁵⁵ three come later, either within⁵⁶ or at the end (3:25 κομίσεται ὁ ἡδίκησεν) of the sentence. The ὅσοι clause in Colossians 2:1 is very different from any other ὅσος clause in the corpus:

θέλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι

ἡλικὸν ἀγῶνα ἔχω ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ
καὶ ὅσοι οὐχ ἑώρακαν τὸ πρόσωπον κτλ.

The substantival relatives of Type II differ from the Pauline pattern in several ways: the relative clause is divided: the relative clause comes early in one (1:9 διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσαμεν οὐ παυόμεθα...) and at the right end in the other (1:6 καθὼς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσατε...); this temporal clause idiom is not found in the Homologoumena.

The one example of an independent relative clause in Colossians (1:29) is a completely different idiom from the independent antithetical relative clauses of the Homologoumena:

νοθετοῦντες...καὶ διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον...

ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον... .

⁵⁵3:17 πᾶν ὃ τι εἰς ποιῆτε ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ
πάντα ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου Ἰησοῦ,....

3:23 ὃ εἰς ποιῆτε, ἐκ ψυχῆς ἐργάζεσθε... .

⁵⁶2:18 μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβεύετω θέλων ἐν
ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἃ ἑώρακεν. Cf. 2:1
also.

εἰς ὃ καὶ κοπιῶ

ἀγωνιζόμενος κατὰ τὴν ἐνεργεῖαν αὐτοῦ... .

In this sentence the final ἵνα clause of the preceding sentence is resumed by εἰς ὃ in the following sentence. A similar but contrasting construction is found in

II Thessalonians 1:11 and 2:14. The Pauline equivalent is εἰς τοῦτο (Rom 14:29; II Cor 2:9).

4. Ephesians

The basic trait of the style of Ephesians is a series of long, involved periods composed of lengthy, successively-subordinated, hypotactic constructions. Although it is popular to speak of parallel members in the sentences of Ephesians, such are extremely difficult to identify (with the possible exception of 1:7-14). Parallelism, such as one finds in Colossians, is uncommon in this epistle. This style contrasts, therefore, in strikingly different ways with both the style of the Homologoumena and that of Colossians. At every point the style of the relative clauses at a phrase-level manifests the same contrasts.⁵⁷

⁵⁷The basic style of Ephesians has been discussed at some length by Percy, Op. cit., pp. 179-252; and Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, Kritik der Epheser--und Kolosser-briefe (Leipzig, 1872), passim, as well as most scholars who have dealt with the problem of the authorship of this epistle. However, most of these has assumed an essential similarity between the style of Ephesians and Colossians and, to a lesser degree, between the epistles and the Homologoumena. A careful, critical study raises serious questions about both of these assumptions. For a fuller description of the style of Ephesians see Excursus II: The Style of Ephesians and Its Relative Clauses.

Although all thirty-nine relative clauses in Ephesians are adjectival, an unusual fact, especially in the light of the frequency of substantival relative clauses in the Homologoumena, these adjective clauses are fully consistent with the peculiar style of Ephesians. None of the relative clauses of this epistle have antecedents with participial phrase modifiers or other relative clauses and only six of the antecedents have any other adjectival qualifier.⁵⁸ A large proportion (25/39) of the antecedents are articular and invariably the relative clause follows the antecedent phrase immediately. In only one case (6:22), a rather uncharacteristic sentence, is the antecedent a proper name. Nomina sacra (2:21 Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν ᾧ...; 3:15 τὸν πατέρα, ἐξ οὗ...; 4:16 Χριστός, ἐξ οὗ...) function as antecedents only in three cases, a very remarkable fact in the light of the alleged liturgical influence on the style of Ephesians.⁵⁹

That almost half (16/36) of the antecedents of relative clauses are governed by prepositions in

⁵⁸1:14; 2:4, 10; 4:16, 30; 6:22.

⁵⁹Both Percy and Schille have argued that the question of the authenticity of Ephesians is complicated by the fact that the style of that epistle is shaped by liturgical influence; Percy, Op. cit., pp. 38ff and passim; (perhaps by implication K. G. Kuhn, "Der Epheserbrief im Lichte der Qumrantexte," New Testament Studies VII (1960-61), pp. 334-346); Gottfried Schille, Frühenristliche Hymnen (Berlin, 1962, 1965), passim, and especially "Der Autor des Epheserbriefes," Theologische Literaturzeitung (1957), pp. 325-334.

characteristic of the style of Ephesians. It is far in excess of the proportion in any other epistle in the corpus. The use of the relatives with the antecedents governed by *κατά*, *διὰ* and *εἰς* calls for additional comment.

The antecedents of three Ephesian relative clauses are governed by *κατά*:

Ephesians 1:9

...κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ,

ἣν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν,

Ephesians 1:20

...κατὰ τὴν ἐνεργεῖαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ,

ἣν ἐνήργηκεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ...

Ephesians 3:11

...κατὰ πρόθεσιν τῶν αἰώνων

ἣν ἐποίησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν,...

In each the antecedent phrase seems to function as a loose transition between the clause in which it occurs and the relative clause which, though syntactically subordinate, actually has become semi-independent in this context.⁶⁰

Parallel constructions are found in the relative clauses whose heads are governed by *εἰς* in 1:6:

εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ

⁶⁰For example, in 1:8 the head construction *κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ* is loosely connected to the participle *γνωρίσας*. It seems to function primarily as a transition between τοῦ θελήματος and ἣν προέθετο which, though subordinate to the prepositional phrase, seems also to be loosely connected with it. Cf. also the phrases with *κατά* which serve as heads of attributival participles.

ἥς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ,...⁶¹

by διὰ in 2:4:

διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην αὐτοῦ
ἣν ἡγάπησεν ἡμᾶς.

and 3:7:

διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου

οὗ ἐγενήθη διάκονος κατὰ τὴν δωρεάν...,

and perhaps πρὸς (3:14):

πρὸς τὸν πατέρα

ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατρία ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται.

For each of these relative constructions there are Ephesian parallels composed of prepositional phrases followed by attributival participles. There are no parallels in the other epistles for this loosely connected Ephesian construction consisting of a prepositional phrase loosely related both to its own clause and also to the relative clause which resumes it.

Another prepositional construction which occurs with great frequency in Ephesians is a relative clause in which both the relative and the antecedent are governed by ἐν. These include:

1:7 ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ, ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν...

1:11 ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐκληρώθημεν...

1:13 ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἡμεῖς...
ἐν ᾧ καί...

2:3 ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς..., ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς...

⁶¹Here the εἰς construction is roughly parallel to long κατὰ phrase before it.

2:22 ἐν κυρίῳ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς...

3:12 ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ..., ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν...⁶²

Most of these clauses are also loosely connected to the head clause which precedes them.

Thus one can justly claim that the relationship between the antecedents and the relative clauses in Ephesians is often quite different from that in other epistles of our corpus. No other constituents come between the relative clause and the antecedent phrase, the antecedent always precedes. Yet, as has been observed above, the relationship between the clause containing the antecedent and the relative often seem quite tenuous. One frequently has the feeling that the relative clause does not qualify the antecedent, but has simply become the vehicle to move the thought forward. As will be seen in Chapter IV, Paul does not use relative clauses to advance his arguments or justify his conclusions, but not so loosely conjunctive with the antecedent as these clauses in Ephesians.

The antecedent is resumed not only by the relative but also by the verb stem more frequently in Ephesians than elsewhere. Examples of this are found in Ephesians:

1:6 τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν...

⁶²Probably to be related to this phenomenon are those clauses introduced by ἐν and the relative which have dative (2:2; 5:18) and genitive (2:21) antecedents. The antecedents of the relative clause in 3:5 is also governed by ἐν: ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ and the relative clauses in 4:30 and 6:16 are also introduced by ἐν.

1:20 τὴν ἐνεργείαν..., ἣν ἐνήργηκεν...

2:4 τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην αὐτοῦ ἣν ἠγάπησεν...

4:1 τῆς κλήσεως ἣς ἐκλήθητε,

The same phenomenon is found only twice in the Homologoumena (I Cor 7:20 τῇ κλήσει ἣ ἐκλήθη II Cor 1:4 τῆς παρακλήσεως ἣς παρακαλεῖν...).

Among the relationships between the relative clauses and their antecedents which are peculiar to Ephesians (and to Colossians in this case) is the explanation, or exegetical relative introduced by ὅ ἐστιν (ἥτις ἐστίν). This construction, which is roughly equivalent to id est or hoc est in Latin, is found four times in Ephesians.⁶³ The normal equivalent in the Homologoumena is the more literary τούτ' ἐστίν.⁶⁴

These peculiarities within the adjectival relative clauses of Ephesians in addition to the absence of substantival and independent relative clauses tend to mark off quite clearly the peculiar style of the Ephesian epistle.

5. I Timothy

The phrase-level style of the relative clauses of I Timothy differs from the style of the Homologoumena less than do Ephesians and Colossians, and often when they do differ, it is in a manner that is characteristic of good Greek style.

⁶³Eph 1:14; 3:13; 6:2(?), 17; Col 1:24, 27; 2:10, 17; 3:5, 14.

⁶⁴Rom 1:12; 7:18; 9:8; 10:6, 7, 8; Phm 12. See Blass-Debrunner, Op. cit., para. 132,2; Robertson, Op. cit., p. 705.

Almost ninety percent (23/26) of the relative clauses of I Timothy are adjectival, a ratio exceeded only by Ephesians. They are unusual in several respects: Ten of the antecedents are anarthrous, a very high ratio. Only one is a proper name; eight are genitives,⁶⁵ the single pronominal antecedent is *τις* (1:20a). About one-half of the antecedents have no other qualifying adjectival construction than the relative clause. In those antecedent phrases which have adjectival constructions other than the relative clauses, these qualifiers are seldom appositives, participles or other relative clauses.⁶⁶

I Timothy shows a marked inclination to use a relative clause to refer to compound antecedents.⁶⁷ It often places word-level modifiers (adjectives) between the antecedent and the relative clause when the antecedent is anarthrous,⁶⁸ and before the antecedent when it is articular.⁶⁹ Phrase-level and genitival modifiers usually come before articular antecedents.⁷⁰ All of these phenomena, most of which are characteristic of good Greek style, can occasionally,

⁶⁵ 1:6; 2:4; 4:3, 6, 14; 6:12, 15, 21. This figure is proportionately higher than anywhere in the Homologoumena, but is characteristic of each of the Pastorals.

⁶⁶ Exceptions are I Tim 6:16a, 16b and perhaps 4:10.

⁶⁷ 1:4, 6, 20b; 6:5, 9.

⁶⁸ 1:4, 5; 4:10; 6:9.

⁶⁹ 1:19; 2:3; 4:6; 6:12, 15, 20.

⁷⁰ 3:16 (τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον ὅς...);
4:14 (τοῦ ἐν σοὶ χαρίσματος, ὃ ἐδόθη...).

In contrast see 1:11.

be found in the Homologoumena, but none of them with the regularity of the style of I Timothy.

One (6:1) of the three substantival relative clauses is a ὅσοι clause in the regular Pauline pattern.⁷¹ The earliest substantival clause follows the verb (1:7 μὴ νοοῦντες μήτε ἀ λέγουσιν...). The substantival clause in 2:10 is unlike any clause in the Homologoumena; its nearest parallel is Colossians 2:2. It is a substantival clause of instrument with a connecting preposition:

μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ...,

ἀλλ' ὁ πρέπει γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν,...⁷²

6. II Timothy

The stylistic evidence at a phrase-level in II Timothy is mixed. On occasion this epistle is the only Antilegomenon to manifest certain idioms of the Homologoumena, and the ratios and frequencies of appearance are often quite like those of the authentic epistles. On the other hand, contrasting idioms, sometimes shared with the other Pastoral Epistles, also are common.

The ratio of adjectival to other relative clauses in II Timothy appears to fall within the normal proportions

⁷¹6:1 ὅσοι εἰσὶν ὑπὸ ζυγὸν δοῦλοι, τοὺς ἰδίους δεσπότας πάσης τιμῆς ἀξίους ἡγεῖσθωσαν,...

⁷²Contrast Rom 2:1; 14:22. That this relative clause is instrumental is indicated by the use of the correlative connectives μή...ἀλλά.... In this passage the relative clause is contrasted to a series of dative case substantives introduced by ἐν. The appositive δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν which follows also indicates the function.

of the Homologoumena (14/24 or 58%) but only six⁷³ of the remaining ten are substantival. II Timothy also contains several Pauline idioms not found elsewhere in the Antilegomena. For example, the only substantival relative resumed by demonstrative is found in 2:2 (ἡ...ταῦτα ...); the only independent antithetical sentences in the Antilegomena are found in:

II Timothy 2:20a, 20b

ἐν μεγάλῃ δὲ οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἔστιν μόνον σκεῦη χρυσᾶ καὶ ἀργυρᾶ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ξύλινα καὶ ὀστράκινα,

καὶ ἃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν

ἃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν.⁷⁴

The ὅσοις clause in 1:18 is also in the Pauline form (καὶ ὅσα ἐν Ἐφέσῳ διηκόνησεν, βέλτιον σὺ γινώσκεις).

The style of the antecedent phrase in II Timothy is similar to that in I Timothy in some ways. For example, only one of the antecedents is qualified by an appositive, participle, or a second relative clause (4:14 Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ χαλκεύς...ὄν ...). The genitive is between the article and the antecedent in 4:8 (ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος, ὄν...). However, in contrast to the tendency in I Timothy the

⁷³1:12b, 18 (ὅσοις); 2:2, 7; 3:8.

⁷⁴These two clauses are probably dependent on or at least influenced by Rom 9:21. Cf. Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 3rd ed. Vol 13: *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Güntner Bornkamm, ed. (Tübingen, 1955), p. 85.

adjectives precede anarthrous antecedents in 1:5, 13 and 2:2. The inclusion of the phrase ἐν σοὶ ἀνυποκρίτου between τῆς and κτίσεως in 1:5 is also characteristic of the style of I Timothy.

Of the six substantival relative clauses in II Timothy three of Type I follow the main clause.⁷⁵ A fourth (3:8) is used as a comparative clause and has no parallel in any other epistle of the Corpus.⁷⁶ The ἐν οἷς... clause in 3:14 is a substantival clause of Type II and is parallel to Philippians 4:11.

In addition to the two typically Pauline independent relative clauses mentioned above (2:20a, 20b), II Timothy contains two others which contrast to a regular idiom of the Homologoumena:⁷⁷

1:6a

δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἀναμνησκω σε ἀναζωπυρεῖν τὸ χάρισμα

⁷⁵ 1:12b οἶδα γὰρ ὃ πεπίστευκα.

2:7 νόει δ' λέγω.

3:14 σὺ δὲ μένε ἐν οἷς ἔμαθες καὶ ἐπιστώθης.

⁷⁶ 3:8 ὃν τρόπον δὲ Ἰάννης καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς

ἀντέστησαν Μωϋσεῖ,

οὕτως καὶ οὗτοι ἀνθίστανται τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ἄνθρωποι κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν, ἀδόκιμοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν.

⁷⁷ These two use the introductory phrase δι' ἣν αἰτίαν relate causally the preceding sentence to the relative sentence. Paul draws such causal relations between successive sentences regularly but he does it by the construction διὰ τοῦτο. (Rom 1:26; 4:16; 5:12; 13:6; 15:9; I Cor 4:17; 11:10, 30; II Cor 2:4; 7:13; 13:10; I Th 3:5, 7). Cf. also the same construction in Eph 1:15; 5:17; 6:13; Col 1:9; and I Tm 1:16. Interestingly II Timothy also employs διὰ τοῦτο in this way in 2:19.

The only other epistle employing the phrase δι' ἣν αἰτίαν is Titus (1:13).

τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν ἐν σοὶ διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου.

1:11

δι' ἣν αἰτίαν [καὶ τὰντα πάσχω,
ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπαισχύνομαι,... .

7. Titus

The phrase-level style of Titus shows marked affinities to I and II Timothy. It contrasts with the Homologoumena to a less marked degree that do Colossians or Ephesians.

Seven of the ten relative clauses in Titus are adjectival.⁷⁸ While six modify antecedents having at least one other qualifying construction,⁷⁹ only one has an appositive (2:13 τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος) and none has an attributival participle. The antecedent in

Titus 1:11

εἰσὶν γὰρ πολλοὶ ἀνυπότακτοι,...,

οὓς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν

οἵτινες ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν... .

is qualified by two relative clauses, but the arrangement is completely contrary to the style of the Homologoumena.

Both substantival relative clauses in Titus belong to Type I and, in contrast to the Homologoumena, both follow the main verb (1:11c διδάσκοντες ἃ μὴ δεῖ ...; 2:1 σὺ δὲ

⁷⁸1:2, 4, 11a, 11b; 2:14; 3:5, 6.

⁷⁹All except κηρύγματι in 1:3. Πολλοί in 1:10 is the subject with three adjectival complements.

λαλεῖ ἃ πρέπει τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ). The single independent relative clause⁸⁰ contrasts with the sentences introduced by διὰ τοῦτο in the Homologoumena and is similar to the independent relative clauses in II Timothy 1:6a, 11.

C. CONCLUSIONS

1. Homogeneity of the Relative Clauses of the Homologoumena

Although this chapter has been limited to the phrase-level characteristics of relative clauses (i.e. the relationships between the clauses and their antecedents), a variety of useful conclusions have emerged. Notably, it became evident that the style of the Homologoumena at this linguistic level was quite homogenous manifesting similar patterns of selection, arrangement and variation throughout the major epistles.

Stated specifically, the phrase-level analysis of the relative clauses of the Homologoumena yielded clear answers to the four questions which introduced this chapter and which, when so answered, result in a description of the phrase-level, relative clause style of those epistles.

(1) Paul utilizes adjectival relative clauses less than one might expect, but the 149 which do occur in the Homologoumena (a) usually occur at the linear right of the antecedent phrase, and other qualifiers of the antecedent, and the head

⁸⁰1:13 δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἔλεγε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως, κτλ.

clause, (b) usually qualify substantival antecedents which are often articular, and (c) are distributed proportionately throughout the Homologoumena. (2) Substantival relative clauses are found more frequently than one might expect (115), appearing regularly in two linear patterns: Type I, which replaces nuclear constituents in the head clauses or which are resumed by the demonstrative, almost always precedes the head clause; Type II, which includes those substantival relative clauses used as non-nuclear constituents and, therefore, all those which are connected to the head clause by a preposition, regularly follows the head clause.

(3) All the independent relative clauses in the Homologoumena are introduced by $\delta\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ and $\delta\varsigma \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in conjunction with each other or equivalents. (4) Adverbial relative clauses, i.e. those clauses in which the relative has become simply a subordinating connective, find limited use in the Homologoumena.

2. The Antilegomena Contrasts With the Homologoumena

Both individually and collectively the Antilegomena contrasts with the style of the Homologoumena at a phrase-level. To see the degree to which that is the case and the details of it, one must examine carefully the preceding section of this chapter, since the Antilegomena also contrast with each other in style. However, it should be noted that: (1) none of the Antilegomena employs substantival relative clauses as frequently in proportion as do the Homologoumena;

(2) none manifests an identical regularity of relationships between antecedents and relative clauses, either linear or otherwise; (3) Type II substantival relative clauses in the Antilegomena contrast general with the idioms of the Homologoumena; (4) independent and adverbial relative clause idioms in the two sets of epistles almost invariably contrast.

3. Comparison of Styles Within Antilegomena.

In spite of the limited area covered by this chapter, it has become possible to make some important observations about the degrees of difference between the styles of the various epistles. Most remarkable of all is the obvious conclusion that the Pastorals and II Thessalonians are closer in style to the Homologoumena, manifesting more characteristic Pauline idioms and more of the Pauline variation in style, than either Ephesians or Colossians. Equally interesting, however, is the clear recognition of the stylistic differences between Ephesians and Colossians. In some ways, but not all, one can rightly observe that each of these epistles are closer in style to particular, but different, sections of the Homologoumena than they are to each other. In order to make these points clearer, it will be necessary to compare Ephesians to Colossians and the Pastoral Epistles to each other.

Colossians and Ephesians have been inseparably bound together in all discussions of the authenticity of

either since the classic work of H. J. Holtzmann.⁸¹ Percy was, in effect, stating the implicit conclusion of most scholars (especially Goodspeed⁸² and Mitton)⁸³, when he says, "Ja, man könnte beinahe sagen, dass der Epheserbrief in stilistischer Hinsicht sich zum Kolosser brief verhält, wie der Kolosserbrief zu den anerkannten Paulusbriefen."⁸⁴ A comparison of the data gathered for this study on the styles of these two epistles leads to a very different conclusion.

The basic character of the styles of the two epistles is quite different. Colossians' styles is dominated by apposition, description and coordination.⁸⁵ On the other

⁸¹Holtzmann, Op. cit.,

⁸²Edgar J. Goodspeed, The Meaning of Ephesians. A Study of the Origin of the Epistle (Chicago, 1933) and also The Key to Ephesians (Chicago, 1956) detailed, often in parallel columns the verbal similarities between Ephesians and Colossians (and the Homologoumena as well).

⁸³C. L. Mitton, The Epistle to the Ephesians. Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose (Cambridge, 1951) esp. pp. 55ff, 98ff, 279ff. Mitton did an extended comparison of the verbal similarities between the two and demonstrates that the verbal similarity is much closer than between any two Pauline epistles.

⁸⁴Ernst Percy, Op. cit., p. 185. It is interesting that Percy concluded that Ephesians was authentic, while Holtzmann, Goodspeed and Mitton reached the opposite conclusion.

⁸⁵The paralleling and compounding of appositives, adjectival clauses and other constructions marks almost every sentence in Colossians. At the most this occurs only in a very limited way in Ephesians with the telic constructions of 3:15-19, the instrumental constructions of 4:2-3, and the commands to put on the armor in 6:14-20.

hand, the style of Ephesians is governed by a vigorous inclination to successive subordination.⁸⁶ It is much more like the normal, albeit more abbreviated, style of the Homologoumena with its usual cause-effect reasoning.⁸⁷

Percy made the assertion, repeated above, on the basis of the fact that both epistles make very heavy use of the same linguistic phenomena.⁸⁸ While he noted that all of the linguistic phenomena studied are also found in the Homologoumena, he claims that they are much longer and more common in Colossians and Ephesians.⁸⁹ In most cases, in fact, he asserts that the particular linguistic phenomenon is more common in Ephesians than Colossians.⁹⁰ This study has shown that the former statement is true, but the latter

⁸⁶It contains almost no parallel adjectival clauses or appositival constructions. Only Colossians 2:1-3 is in this same style. Col 1:3-8 and 1:24-29 do employ a kind of successive subordination. However, in each passage every adjectival construction has a parallel member, as do the predicative participles.

⁸⁷The Homologoumena does contain isolated sections which are similar in style to Colossians, primarily Romans 1:1-7; 4:16-18; 9:3-5; 16:1-18; I Corinthians 4:17 and the letter of recommendation in Philemon. However, these are not only quite limited in scope, but they also serve rather different functions from Colossians.

⁸⁸For example, appositives, synonyms, long clause, abstract nouns in the genitive, final infinitives, relative clause, participles, series of prepositional phrases, *ev* constructions at the end clauses, *iva* clauses, successive words with the same item.

⁸⁹Percy, *Op. cit.*, pp. 36-46. Cf. also pp. 19-35.

⁹⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 21, 22, 24, 25 and elsewhere.

one is not.⁹¹

The use of relative clauses in each epistle illustrates better than any other way the differences in style. Although both utilize relative clauses more frequently than do any of the remaining eleven epistles in the Corpus, their use of these clauses diverges in the same way that their dominating style differs. Four-fifths of the relative clauses in Colossians and all of those in Ephesians are adjectival. Two-thirds of the antecedents in Ephesians are articular, but 96% of substantival antecedents are articular in Colossians. Two-thirds of the relative-clause antecedents in Colossians have one or more adjectival modifiers and the paralleling of relative clauses with other relative clauses, attributival participles and/or appositives is a regular trait of the author's style. An unusually large number of the relative clauses resume genitival

⁹¹Proportionately speaking Colossians contains a much larger number of relative clauses, predicative participles, co-ordinated constructions at every level, synonyms, appositives, and genitives of definition as well as an equal number of attributival participles. These are exactly the stylistic phenomena that one would expect, given the epistle's penchant for parallelism and apposition and its regular practice of qualifying verbs by predicative participles. The other style traits shared both with Ephesians and the Homologoumena, not only occur less frequently in Colossians than in Ephesians, but they also play a less integral role in the style of the sentences of that epistle.

On the other hand, final constructions of all kinds, clauses ending in *ἐν* phrases, successive words with the same stem, single adjectival relative clauses, relative clauses referring to phrase-level antecedents and substantival participles are much more frequent and characteristic of the style of Ephesians.

antecedents and six of the relative clauses, in contrast to three in Ephesians, introduce epexegetical appositives with ὅ ἐστιν.

In contrast, there are no clear examples of the paralleling of relative clauses and/or attributival participles in Ephesians. In the two examples of a relative clause used in conjunction with appositives, the relative clause qualifies the appositive in one (4:1b) and the other is a sentence which poses many stylistic and source-critical problems (6:22). Relative clauses in Ephesians almost invariably follow the antecedent immediately. Almost half of them refer to antecedents governed by prepositions, often loosely connected to the preceding clause and serving primarily as a means of thought transition from one clause to another.

On the use of relative clauses one must recognize that Ephesians and Colossians relate in different ways to the Homologoumena. The following chart, arranged from least frequent to most frequent will illustrate this point:

Number of Relative Clauses	Homologoumena	Ephesians	Colossians
Parallel Adjectival Clauses	Ephesians	Homologoumena	Colossians
Parallel Appositives	Ephesians	Homologoumena	Colossians
Articular Antecedents	Homologoumena	Ephesians	Colossians
Substantival Clauses	Ephesians	Colossians	Homologoumena

Genitival Antecedents	Homologoumena	Ephesians	Colossians
Prepositional Phrase Antecedents	Homologoumena	Colossians	Ephesians
Proper Name and <u>Nomina</u> <u>Sacra</u> Antecedents	Ephesians	Homologoumena	Colossians
Nuclear Constituent Antecedents	Colossians	Ephesians	Homologoumena

Although the evidence of a literary relationship between Ephesians and Colossians is too strong to deny,⁹² the conclusion of Percy, cited above and implicit elsewhere, must be questioned - Ephesians is not always related to Colossians as Colossians is related to the Homologoumena. Rather they are often related to each other as they are not related to Paul, and they are often related to Paul as they differ from each other.⁹³

The Pastorals stand in a very different set of stylistic relationships both to each other and to the Homologoumena, than do Colossians and Ephesians. (1) The literary, historical and theological evidence against the authenticity of anyone of them, as it now stands, is regarded by most scholars as overwhelming and conclusive.⁹⁴ (2) All

⁹²Compare, e.g. Col 4:7-8 and Eph 6:22.

⁹³We shall witness this same set of relationships at each level in this study. It is as if two writers took different stylistic traits from a third writer and made them unbreakable rules of style.

⁹⁴The Pastorals were the first epistles of the Pauline Corpus to be challenged on authorship; Cf. Intro., n. 1. After Heinrich Julius Holtzmann in Die Pastoralbriefe,

three are set off from the Homologoumena by the constant use of a more refined and formal Greek. (3) The basic character of the style of the author(s) is declarative and instructional (a very frequent use of imperatives) rather than logical (from cause to effect) or appositional. (4) One does not find either the artistically constructed sections or the consistency of sentence forms manifested in Ephesians and Colossians, nor does one find the broken sentences and anacolutha of the Homologoumena.

These differences are manifest in the relative clauses also. This chapter has shown that there are many characteristic Pauline idioms in the Pastorals,⁹⁵ usually

kritisch und exegetisch bearbeitet (, 1880), examined all the arguments against the authenticity of these epistles, most scholars have agreed that the Pastoral Epistles are not genuine Pauline epistles. However, some scholars do claim the ability to distinguish several authentic fragments in these epistles; cf. e.g. P. N. Harrison, The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles (Oxford, 1921), pp. 87-135; and Paulines and Pastorals (London, 1964), pp. 106-128. For a fuller survey of the literature, cf. Paul Feine, Johannes Behm, and Werner Georg Kummel, Introduction to the New Testament, 14th ed., A. J. Mattill, Jr. trans. (Nashville, 1965), pp. 261-271.

⁹⁵E.g. The only ὅσοι clauses in the Antilegomena manifesting the stereotyped Pauline form are in I Timothy 6:6, and II Timothy 1:18. II Timothy is the only Antilegomenon which shows a ratio of substantival to adjectival relative clauses comparable to the Homologoumena. II Timothy 2:2 is the only example in the Antilegomena of a substantival relative clause resumed by the demonstrative and 2:20 contains the only examples of independent antithetical sentences, characteristic of Paul. II Timothy is the only epistle in the Antilegomena with roughly the same ratio of articular to anarthrous antecedents as that found in the Homologoumena. The ratio of substantival to adjectival clauses is much closer to the Pauline average than that of Colossians and especially Ephesians.

more proportionately in II Timothy⁹⁶ than in I Timothy or Titus. On the other hand, the epistles do contain and even share a number of peculiar relative clause idioms.⁹⁷

But what of the relationship of the Pastorals to each other? To what degree do they share a common style and how are relative clauses related to it? As this study proceeds the relative clauses of the different Pastorals will be shown to be related in a variety of ways. At this point it will be sufficient to discuss the use of adjectival constructions in the Pastorals and the utilization of

⁹⁶ P. N. Harrison, The Problem of Pastoral Epistles and Paulines and Pastorals among others has sought to establish authentic fragments in II Timothy, specifically 1:16-18; 3:10-11; 4:1-2a, 5b-22a, as well as Titus 3:12-15. There are relative clauses in these sections, but these bear no characteristic Pauline traits. Harrison's statistics also show that II Timothy is closer to the Homologoumena than I Timothy or Titus.

The style picture described below is rather consistent throughout the Pastorals and distinct from the Homologoumena. However, the continuum of relationships of the inchoval epistles to the Homologoumena will bear much future study. P. N. Harrison's two books (The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles and Paulines and Pastorals) showed almost invariably that in vocabulary and certain style traits II Timothy was closest to the Homologoumena and I Timothy was farthest away, stylistically speaking. My own studies of both relative clauses and of the use of certain common connective pronouns, and other phenomena show invariably the continuum: Homologoumena, II Timothy, Titus, I Timothy. On the other hand this study has not found evidence to support the allegedly authentic fragments in II Timothy claimed by Harrison (Problem, pp. 115-135 and Paulines, pp. 106-128).

⁹⁷ E.g. The substantival δ $\pi\rho\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\iota$ $\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\upsilon$... in I Timothy 2:10 has no real parallel in our Corpus. Neither does the comparative clause introduced by $\delta\upsilon$ $\tau\acute{o}\sigma\kappa\omicron\nu$... (II Tim 3:8). The three examples of $\delta\iota$ $\eta\upsilon$ $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\upsilon$ (II Tim 1:6a, 11; Tit 1:13) contrasts with Paul's usual $\delta\iota\alpha$ $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omicron$.

relative clauses as adjectives therein.

The Pastorals individually and collectively make heavier use of adjectives and a lighter use of the definite article than any other epistle or body of literature in the New Testament. A large number of the adjectives are employed to state the qualifications for bishops or presbyters (I Tim 3:2-7; Tit 2:2-6), deacons (I Tim 3:8-13) widows, and other leaders. The majority, however, are utilized as simple attributives or predicates with substantives and stand regularly in the normal Greek attributival positions.⁹⁸ Several arrangements⁹⁹ of substantival head and attributival adjectives, which are characteristic of a more refined Greek, occur much more

⁹⁸I Tim 1:4 γενεαλογίας ἀπεράντοις (cf. also II Tim 1:9 κλήσει ἁγία; Titus 1:16 πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν); I Tim 1:5 καθαρῶς καρδίας (cf. also II Tim 3:14 ἱερὰ γράμματα; Tit 1:4 γυναικὶ τέκνω). I Tim 1:16 τὴν ἁπασαν μακροθυμίαν (cf. also II Tim 4:8 ὁ δίκαιος κριτής; Tit 1:2 ἀφευδῆς θεός). I Tim 5:25 τὰ ἔργα τὰ καλὰ (cf. also II Tim 2:1 τῇ χάριτι τῇ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ; Tit 1:9 τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ).

⁹⁹E.g., (1) more substantives are anarthrous and often the article, if it occurs, occurs only with a succeeding attributive (e.g. II Tim 1:9 θεοῦ τοῦ σώματος ...). (2) More attributival participles are anarthrous (e.g. II Tim 3:8 ἄνθρωποι κατεφθάρμενοι ...) and with a few exceptions, most of which are related to the central Christian traditions (e.g. I Tim 2:6; II Timothy 1:9-10 (5x)), attributival participial phrases are quite often only one word. (3) Prepositional phrases, adjectives, participial phrases, possessive genitives and other attributival constituents occur more frequently between the article and the substantive than is customary in Paul. (E.g. Tit 1:9 τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδασκίαν πιστοῦ λόγου; II Tim 1:5 τῆς ἐν σοὶ ἀνυποκρίτου πίστεως). (4) There are few appositives except with the nomina sacra.

commonly in all the Pastorals than they do in the Homologoumena.

The relative clauses of the Pastorals are both consistent with and illustrate this peculiar style. Forty-four of the sixty are adjectival. Slightly more than half of these (23/44) have articular antecedents. Most of the relative clauses follow the antecedent and/or its phrase immediately,¹⁰⁰ even if this circumstance necessitates an infraction of Behaghel's Law.¹⁰¹ Many of the antecedents have other attributives, usually adjectives,¹⁰² but only four have appositives.¹⁰³ One word attributival participles qualify

¹⁰⁰The exceptions are I Tim 1:15; 3:15; 6:16; II Tim 4:15, 18; and perhaps Titus 1:11a.

¹⁰¹Note in II Tim 1:13 the ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ and in Titus 1:11 the ἀισχροῦ κέρδους χάριν after the relative clauses. According to Behaghel's Law phrase-level constructions usually precede clause-level constructions. Contrast Ephesians which holds rigorously to Behaghel's Law.

¹⁰²Adjectives: I Timothy 1:4, 6, 9; 4:6; 6:10, 12, 16, 21; II Tim 1:5, 15; 2:2; Titus 1:2; 2:14; 3:6.
Participles: I Tim 4:10; II Tim 1:13;
Genitives: I Tim 1:11; 2:4; 3:15, 16; 6:15; II Tim 1:6; 2:9; 4:8.
Prepositional Phrases: I Tim 4:14; II Tim 1:5; Titus 1:11a; 3:5.
Others: I Tim 2:7.

¹⁰³I Tim 2:4 τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ, 2:7 μεσίτης... ἄνθρωπος, Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ὁ δὸς ἑαυτοῦ... τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῦς ἰδίοις (in this case the relative qualifies the appositive το μαρτύριον); II Tim 4:15 Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ χαλκεύς; and Tit 2:14 τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς. In each of these cases except II Tim 4:15 one is dealing with stereotyped traditional formulations.

the antecedents of relative clauses (I Tim 4:10; II Tim 1:13) but the only example of parallel relative clauses and/or participial phrases of any length is in I Timothy 6:15-6 (compound adjectives, appositives, attributival and relative clauses in that order), and II Timothy 1:9-10 (six attributival participles arranged in three parallel pairs).¹⁰⁴ An unusually large number of the relative clauses (14) resume compound antecedents.

After comparing and contrasting the stylistic similarities and differences within the natural groupings in the Antilegomena, even when limited to the relationships between relative clauses and antecedents, one can safely assert that, in terms of relative distance from style of the Homologoumena the Antilegomena can be arranged as follows:

Homologoumena - II Thes - II Tim - Tit - I Tim - Eph
Col

Such a judgment is based on the frequency with which Pauline idioms occur, the number of contrasting non-Pauline idioms present, the presence of the characteristic Pauline variety of style and form and the distribution of relative clause types.

4. Traditional Liturgical Formulas and Style

While this chapter has not devoted an extended

¹⁰⁴The only other possible pairs of parallel relative clauses are in II Tim 2:20 (antithetical independent relative clauses) and Titus 2:17-18. In the latter it is impossible to ascertain with certainty whether the antecedent of οἱτινες is αὐτῶν or ὑμῶν αἰσῶν καὶ φιλῶν. But analogy to II Tim 2:18 the latter alternative seems preferable.

section to the analysis of the alleged creedal and hymnic materials and their respective styles, it has within its limited scope reached some important conclusions. First, we have seen no evidence that sets off such materials from their present context, except the paralleling and length of adjectival clause-level constructions in the Pastorals where the antecedent is God, Jesus or the Holy Spirit. (I Tim 2:4-6; perhaps also 3:16; II Tim 1:9-11; Titus 2:14). Second and more important, we discovered that the style traits of the alleged hymnic materials in both Colossians and Ephesians were found throughout that particular epistle and contrasted to each other. This would call seriously into question both the stylistically-based identification of traditional materials and the identification of a liturgical style based the parallels between Ephesians and Colossians. Although later chapters may produce important positive evidence, the results thus far are negative.

EXCURSUS I

THE STYLE OF COLOSSIANS AND ITS RELATIVE CLAUSES

When one has carefully analyzed and diagrammed every sentence in Colossians,¹ one is struck by a number of important and interrelated observations on the style of that epistle. (1) Throughout the epistle there is

¹The style of Colossians has occasioned much scholarly comment because it is inseparably connected to the question of authenticity of the epistle. Mayerhoff, who was the first scholar to deny its authenticity, noted its many similarities to Ephesians. Ernst Theodor Mayerhoff, Der Brief an die Colosser mit vornehmlicher Berücksichtigung der drei Pastoral-Briefe kritisch geprüft (Berlin, 1838), (this book was unavailable to me but is discussed in the works of Lohse and Percy discussed below).

Holtzmann did the most thorough study of the style gathering Pauline and unPauline traits and vocabulary and making extensive comparisons. Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, Kritik der Epheser- und Kolosserbriefe (Leipzig, 1872), pp. 104-121. Most introductions since that time have commented on the details of the style of this epistle. Cf. e.g. Adolf Jülicher, An Introduction to the New Testament, Janet Penrose, trans. (New York, 1904), pp. 137-138; H. J. Holtzmann, Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Leipzig, 1886), pp. 280-283; Paul Feine, Johannes Behm and Werner Georg Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, 14th ed., A. J. Matill, Jr. trans. (Nashville, 1965), pp. 240-241. The most recent discussion of the style of Colossians are found in: Ernst Percy, Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe (Lund, 1946), pp. 16-60; and in Eduard Lohse, Colossians and Ephesians, Williams R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris, trans. (Philadelphia, 1971), pp. 64-91.

All of these scholars, and especially Holtzmann, Percy and Lohse, have pointed to the details of the style of Colossians which will be discussed below. But none of them discuss the overall style of the epistle. Perhaps the single exception to that statement is Lohse's comment on the liturgical-hymnic style and the long sentences of Colossians (Op. cit., p. 89).

This is the significance of this excursus. It seeks to relate those stylistic details to an overall characterization of the style of Colossians.

evidence of the careful construction of the sentences.

(2) Although the aim of Colossians is argumentative, i.e. to combat a heresy, the style of the letter is appositional and adjectival. (3) The kinds of material vary within the epistle, yet the style is remarkably uniform. (4) Of course, the most basic characteristic, i.e. its almost endless and involved sentences, is obvious to any reader. All of these observations, except the fourth, are debated and demand the marshalling of evidence.

1. Carefully Constructed Sentences

While there are almost poetic sections in the Homologoumena, its rough form, frequent anacolantha, and redundant connectives are the language of one who is not self-conscious of literary style, i.e. one who does not distinguish oral from written Greek style. In contrast, Colossians throughout is in the language of a writer who is highly self-conscious of his style. He seeks balanced parallels, constructs word-plays and uses contrasts artfully.

The most artfully constructed section in the epistle, 1:15-20, will be discussed in connection with the use of relative clauses below. However, the use of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ is an artistic trait of that section, not essentially related to the utilization of the relative clauses. In Colossians 1:15-20 it is used in almost every phrase and in a variety of different ways:

...

...πάσης κτίσεως

τὰ πάντα...
 ... πρὸ πάντων
 ... τὰ πάντα...
 ...
 ...
 ... ἐν πᾶσιν
 ... πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα
 ... τὰ πάντα...
 ...

As similar self-conscious employment of πᾶς is found in 1:10-11.

...ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ...
 ...εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρεσκείαν
 ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ...
 ...
 ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει....

Colossians 2:13-15 is an example of a different, but equally artful, construction:

καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ
 τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν,
 συνεζωοποίησεν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ,
 χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα·
 ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν
 ὃ ἦν ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν,
 καὶ αὐτὸ ἦρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου,
 προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ·
 ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας

ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρησίᾳ,
θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ.

θεός is the understood actor with each verb. Each verse has three members: an introductory participial phrase, the main clause, a concluding participial phrase. Each introductory participial phrase contains a two part constituent that is almost appositional (or synonymous) in character. Otherwise the members are quite terse.²

Colossians 2:11-12, to be discussed below is only slightly less striking.

In the parenetic section parallel sentences are constructed by τὰ ἄνω... (3:1-2) or ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν (3:4), as well as ποτε-νυν (3:7-8) and ἀπειθοῦσάμενοι... ἐνδυσάμενοι ... (3:9-10). Other traits, such as the alternation of equivalent parallel constructions discussed below, strengthen the conclusion that the writer of Colossians carefully constructs his sentences throughout.³

2. Appositional Style

Although Colossians was written to combat a heresy, its style is not argumentative with each clause logically connected to the preceding for the sake of developing the

²Similar constructions are found in 3:17 and elsewhere.

³This conclusion is contrary to the assertion of Percy (Op. cit., p. 36) that the distinctive stylistic traits of Colossians are limited to the first two chapters. While one must admit that there are stylistic differences between the earlier and later chapters of Colossians (i.e. longer sentences), this excursus will demonstrate that the basic style is consistent throughout.

argument. Rather the argument, if such it may be styled, is appositional. That is, it consists of appositional or parallel constructions in which the succeeding says the same thing as the preceding, but in different words.⁴ The frequent use of appositives, compound constituents, parallel constructions, and genitives of definition, all of which are characteristic of Colossians, are the major components of this style.

No writing in the New Testament employs appositives more heavily than does Colossians. Every proper name except Δημῶς (4:14), Νύμφαν (4:15), and Ἀρχίππῳ (4:16) has at least one appositional construction and Τύχιος (4:7) has three.⁵ The use of nouns and whole phrases in apposition to and parallel to each other is even more remarkable. The first example of this phenomenon

⁴To fully appreciate this one needs only to compare Ephesians, which also contains long, involved sentences. There there is almost no paralleling of clauses. Rather each clause and sentence is built upon the preceding either in successive subordination or by causal and inferential conjunctions. This contrast is made the more striking by our inability to determine just what Ephesians is arguing about. Contrast also the heavy use of causal, final, and conditional constructions in the Homologoumena contrasts markedly with the style of Colossians (Cf. Excursus II, pp. 111-9).

⁵1:1 (bis), 7; 4:7, 9, 10 (bis), 11, 12, 14. In contrast, however, the use of proper names with titles in the nomina sacra (e.g. τῷ Θεῷ πατρὶ and τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in 1:3), common in the Homologoumena, seems less common in Colossians. A quick check shows only 1:2, 3; 2:7; 3:17, 25. Contrast this to the extended use in Romans 1-6: τῷ κυρίῳ Χριστῷ in Col 3:25 is unique.

is τοῖς ἐν Κολασσαῖς--ἁγίοις καὶ πιστοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ (1:2).⁶

Also closely related to this is the intensive use of equative relative clauses, i.e. those containing a copula verb and an identifier or predicate noun.⁷

Colossians uses many more equative relative clauses than any other epistle in the Corpus (12/31) and in the case of the exegetical ὅ ἐστιν constructions the use of Colossians contrasts with the homologoumena's τοῦτ' ἐστιν.⁸

⁶In addition to 1:2 and excluding proper names and nomina sacra, Col contains the following other examples of appositional and parallel noun phrases: τὴν ἀφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν (1:14), εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου--πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως (1:15), τοῦ σώματος--τῆς ἐκκλησίας (1:17), ἀρχή--πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν (1:18), ἐγώ--Παῦλος (1:23), τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ--τὸ μυστήριον.. (1:25), Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν--ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης (1:27), εἰς πᾶν πλοῦτος τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως--εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ (2:2), τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ--Χριστοῦ (2:2), κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων--κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (2:8), ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκὸς--ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (2:11), τὰ μέλη--πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, κτλ. (3:5), ...ποτε--ὅτε... (3:7), ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ--ἅγιοι καὶ ἡγαπημένοι (3:12), διδάσκοντες καὶ νουθετοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς--ψαλμοὶς ὕμνοις ψαλμοῖς πνευματικαῖς ἐν τῇ χάριτι ἄδοντες ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν τῷ θεῷ (3:16), Τύχιος--ἀδελφός--διάκονος--σύνδουλος (4:7), Ὀνήσιμος--ἀδελφῷ (4:9), Ἀρίσταρχος--συναίμαλτος (4:10), Μάρκος--ἀνεψιός (4:10), Ἰησοῦς--Ἰουστός (4:11), Ἐπαφράς--δοῦλος (4:12), Λουκᾶς--πατέρας (4:14).

⁷Cf. e.g. Ἐπαφρᾶ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ συνδούλου ἡμῶν, ὅς ἐστιν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διάκονος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Also 1:7, 15, 23b, 24, 25, 27b; 2:10, 17; 3:5, 14.

⁸Rom 1:12; 7:18; 9:8; 10:6, 7, 8; Phm 12. See also F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. 9th ed. Tr. and Rev. by Robert W. Funk. (Chicago, 1961), para. 132, 2 and A.A. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Nashville, 1934), p. 705.

Clearly related to this appositional style is the Colossian writer's propensity for compounding synonyms (or appositives). This tendency persists throughout the epistle with constructions of all types. One of the earliest examples of this construction type is: καρποφορούμενον--αύξανόμενον (1:6) and προσευχόμενοι--αἰτούμενοι (... εὐχαριστοῦντες) (1:9).⁹

It is not contended here that all of the examples in n. 9 are synonyms, except perhaps in the given context in Colossians. Neither should one assume that all the synonyms stand in a semi-appositional relationship. However, a large number do and such relationships are characteristic of the style of Colossians.

⁹Other examples include: πάση σοφίᾳ--συνέσει πνευματικῇ (1:9), ... καρποφοροῦντες--αύξανόμενοι (1:10), ὑπομονὴν--μακροθυμίαν (1:11), ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους--μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ (1:13), ἀπηλλοτριωμένους--ἐχθρούς (1:21), ἀγίους--ἀμώμους--ἀνεγκλήτους (1:22), τεθεμελιωμένοι--ἐδραστοί (1:23), ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων--ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν (1:26), νουθετοῦντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον--διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον (1:28), σοφίας--γνώσεως (2:3), τὴν τάξιν--τὸ στερῆμα (2:5), ἐρριζώμενοι--ἐποικοδομοῦμενοι--βεβαιούμενοι (2:7), ἀρχῆς--ἐξουσίας (2:10), τοῖς παραπτώμασιν--τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν (2:13), τὰς ἀρχάς--τὰς ἐξουσίας (2:15), ταπεινοφροσύνη--θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων (2:18), ἀφῶν--συνδέσμων (2:19), ἐπιχορηγοῦμενον--συμβιβαζόμενον (2:19), ἐντάλματα--διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων (2:22), ἐθελοθηρητὰ--ταπεινοφροσύνη--ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος (2:23), τὰ ἄνω ζυντεῖτε--τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖτε (3:1-2), πορνείαν--ἀκαθαρσίαν (3:5), παθὸς--ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν--πλεονεξίαν (3:5), ὀργὴν--θυμὸν (3:8), βλασφημίαν--αἰσχρολογία ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν (3:8), ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων--χαρίζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς (3:13), διδάσκοντες--νουθετοῦντες (3:16), φάλμοις--θμνοῖς--ῥαῖς πνευματικαῖς (3:16), τὸ δίκαιον--τὴν ἰσότητά (4:1), γρηγοροῦντες--προσευχόμενοι (4:2), τέλειοι--πεπληροφορημένοι ἐν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ (4:12).

Another mark of the style of Colossians is the heavy employment of genitives. This is especially true in Chapters 1 and 2, although there are no less than sixteen in the shorter sentences of Chapter 4. The most striking category of genitives in the epistle, however, are the genitives of definition, i.e. those genitives, (usually abstract nouns) which definite and stand in an appositional relationship to the substantives that they qualify.

A list (no necessarily exhaustive) of such abstract genitives of definition and/or apposition must include: τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (1:5), τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων (1:12), διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ, δι' αὐτοῦ (1:20), τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου (1:27), πᾶν πλοῦτος τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως (2:2), ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ (2:2), τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος (2:9), τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός (2:11), τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου (2:20), τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (4:3). Extended series of abstract nouns are also found in 1:13, 24; and 2:12, among others.

While no one would claim that the linguistic characteristics cited on the preceding pages are peculiar to Colossians, nonetheless the greater frequency of occurrence and the pervasiveness throughout the epistle

establish them as descriptive of the style of the author.¹⁰
The configuration of style traits itself makes obvious the
appositional nature of the epistle's style.

3. Consistency of Style

It is quite clear that the sentences of Colossians
1-2 are generally longer than those of the last two
chapters.¹¹ Considering the nature of the material in
these chapters, this is a natural tendency. Nonetheless,
both the phenomena that will here be cited to show that
the style of Colossians is consistent and almost all of
the other syntactical phenomena described in this excursus
are found in every type of material in the epistle.

One of the more striking and consistent syn-
tactical constructions in Colossians is the frequent de-
fining of the predicate of a clause by succeeding adverbial
participle.¹² Equally consistent and pervasive throughout

¹⁰Percy, (Op. cit., pp. 19-35), has gathered com-
parable phenomena in the Homologoumena and elsewhere. He
concurs in the judgment that they are found much more fre-
quently in Colossians than in the Homologoumena.

¹¹Percy (Op. cit., p. 36) treats chapter 3 as the
beginning of the parenetic section. However, the break down
into doctrinal and parenetic sections, by analogy to Romans
and Ephesians, will hardly work here. One cannot be sure
where the thanksgiving ends and the teaching begins. The
imperatives begin in 2:6 but the parenthesis proper does not
begin before 3:5 or perhaps 3:18. The personal epistolary
material is concentrated in 1:1-2 and 4:7-18, however, in
contrast to Ephesians, epistolary references are found
throughout Colossians: e.g. 1:9, 24; 2:1.

¹²Cf., e.g. 1:3 εὐχαριστοῦμεν ... προσευχόμενοι,
... ἀκούσαντες Also 1:9-11 (ter), 20, 23 (bis), 28 (bis),
29; 2:2, 5 (bis), 6-7 (quar), 12, 13, 14, 15, 18-19 (quar),
20; 3:9-10 (bis), 13 (bis), 16 (ter), 17, 22, 24; 4:1, 2-3
(bis), 5, 6, 12.

the epistle is the tendency to compound and coordinate constructions of every linguistic type.¹³ This compounding of constructions may include the coordination of equivalent constructions, e.g. participles and adjectives, relative clauses and attributive participles. When such combinations of equivalent constructions occur they are often alternated for stylistic effect.¹⁴

The characteristically heavy use of the prepositional phrases introduced by ἐν and especially the ending of clauses with ἐν phrases continues throughout.¹⁵ The very heavy employment of appositives and other adjectival constructions, which are characteristic of the style of Colossians, also continues throughout. The peculiar loosely-connected final infinitive is found in both chapter 1 and 4.¹⁶

The presence of almost all of these characteristic constructions in each chapter and in epistolary, parenetic,

¹³Adverbial participles: see note 12 above. Adjectives: 1:2, 22; 3:12; 4:1, 9, 12. Verbs: 1:6, 24, and elsewhere (including participles). Nouns: 1:1, 4, 9, 11, 15 (bis), 15 (quar); 2:3, 5, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 22 (quar); 3:5 (quin), 8 (quar), 16 (ter); 4:10 (ter), 14 (bis). Prepositional phrases: 1:6, 15, 16, 20, 26; 2:2, 8 and elsewhere. Relative clauses: 1:14-19 (ter), 23, 24-25 (?), 27-28; 2:10-12 (ter), 22-23; 3:6. Interestingly there are no coordinate attributive or substantival participles.

¹⁴E.g. 1:5-6 (Ptc-R C), 7-8 (R C-Ptc), 12-13 (Ptc-R C), 23 (R C-Ptc-R C), 23 (Ptc-Adj-Ptc).

¹⁵Cf. e.g. 1:6, 8, 12, 29; 2:4, 15; 3:4; 4:1, 12.

¹⁶1:10 ἵνα πληρωθῇτε ..., περιπατῆσαι ἐξ ἰσχύος τοῦ κυρίου Cf. also 1:22, 25; 4:3, 6. Percy, *Op. cit.*, p. 34.

thanksgiving and doctrinal materials leads inevitably to the conclusion that the style of Colossians is consistent throughout and, with respect to chapter 1-2, is not the result of liturgical influences, as Percy has alleged.

4. Relative Clauses and the Style of Colossians

As might be expected, Colossians makes extended use of the relative clauses (43) as well as attributival (16) and adverbial (44) participles.¹⁷ In every way the use of the relative clauses is consistent with and characteristic of the style of the author.

First, they all play an integral role in the style conscious, artfully constructed sentences of the epistle. No section of the epistle manifests a more artistic structure than 1:15-20.

ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, πρωτότοκος
πάσης κτίσεως,

ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς
καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα,
εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ
εἴτε ἑξουσίαι·

(τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν
ἐκτισαί·)

καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων

καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν,

καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος,
τῆς ἐκκλησίας·

¹⁷ Several supplementary (e.g. 1:9) and periphrastic participles (e.g. 1:6; 2:10) are also found in Colossians. In contrast to both the Homologoumena and Epnesians, there are only two substantival participles in Colossians (2:17; 3:25).

ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν,

ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων,

ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι
 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα
 εἰς αὐτόν,

εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ
 αὐτοῦ, δι' αὐτοῦ εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἴτε
 τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

Note the paralleling of the two almost perfectly balanced, equative relative clauses. Each identifier (εἰκῶν and ἀρχή respectively) has an appositional phrase introduced by πρωτότοκος and each is explained by an exegetical ὅτι clause. The earlier ὅτι clause (1:16-17) is actually composed of four coordinate clauses following this pattern: ἐν αὐτῷ ..., αὐτός ἐστιν ..., ...ἐν αὐτῷ..., αὐτός ἐστιν... The later ὅτι clause (vs. 19) parallels constructions introduced by ἐν αὐτῷ and δι' αὐτοῦ. Note also the contrasting pairs in the passage: ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα; εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι;¹⁸ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτόν ...and ...τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. The employment of πᾶς in a variety of constructions and in almost every clause must have been consciously done.

¹⁸ We have already noted that the author has a predilection to pair synonyms in list: e.g. 2:7, 10; 3:5 and especially 3:8.

Colossians 2:11-12 is only slightly less striking:

ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ ἐν τῇ
ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ
τοῦ Χριστοῦ,

συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι,

ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας
τοῦ θεοῦ

τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

Here parallel relative clauses are introduced by ἐν ᾧ καὶ plus an aorist passive predicate. Each predicate is qualified by an instrumental constituent (περιτομῇ... ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει... and διὰ τῆς πίστεως respectively) and each clause concludes with a participial phrase.

Second, relative clauses are a major integral component of the appositional style of the epistle. For example, as we noted above, the epexegetical ὅ ἐστιν clauses are means of introducing appositives into the epistle. An examination of these clauses, which occur more frequently in Colossians than in Ephesians, will demonstrate this point:

1:24

...τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ,

ὅ ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία.¹⁹

1:27

...τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν,

ὅς ἐστιν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν,...²⁰

¹⁹Cf. 1:17 αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος, τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

²⁰Cf. 2:2 τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ,... .
4:3 λαλῆσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

2:10

...ἐν αὐτῷ...

ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας.²¹2:17...ἐν βρώσει καὶ ἐν πόσει ἢ ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς
ἢ νεομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων,

ἃ ἐστιν σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, κτλ.

3:5

...καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν

ἣτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλατρία, ...

3:14

ἐπὶ πᾶσιν δὲ τοῦτοις τὴν ἀγάπην,

ὅ ἐστιν σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος.

Colossians also uses equative clauses (i.e.

clauses with a equative or copula verb and an identifier or predicate nominative) more than any other epistle in the Corpus. These clauses also have the effect of adding appositives. The ὅ ἐστιν clauses above are examples of such clauses. In addition to them Colossians contains the following:

1:8

...ἀπὸ Ἑπαφρᾶ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ συνδούλου ἡμῖν,

ὅς ἐστιν πιστὸς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διάκονος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

1:15-20

...τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ,

²¹cf. 1:18 αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος.

.....
 ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν,...πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως...·

ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ...

Another example of the author's appositional style is the frequency with which he combines parallel relative clauses, relative clauses with attributival participles, and relative clauses and/or attributival participles with appositives. In fact, almost every antecedent of a relative clause in Colossians is qualified by at least one other adjectival construction.

Such parallel constructions containing relative clauses are found in:

1:7-8

Ἐπαφρᾶ	τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ συνδούλου ἡμῶν
	ὅς ἐστιν...διάκονος...,
	ὁ καὶ δηλώσας... .

1:12-13

τῷ πατρὶ	τῷ ἰκανώσαντι...
	ὅς ἐρρύσατο...μετέστησεν... .

1:14-20

τοῦ υἱοῦ	ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, ...,
	ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν, ...·
	ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή, ...

1:23

τοῦ εὐαγγελίου	οὗ ἠκούσατε...,
	τοῦ κηρυχθέντες...,
	οὗ ἐγενόμην... .

1:24-25

τοῦ σώματος ὅς ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία,
ἧς ἐγενόμην... .

1:27-28

τοῦ μυστηρίου ὅς ἐστιν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐλπίς... .
ὃν ἡμεῖς καταγγέλλομεν... .

2:2-3

τοῦ μυστηρίου Χριστοῦ
ἐν ᾧ εἰσὶν πάντες... .

2:10-12

αὐτῷ ὅς ἐστιν κεφαλὴ...
ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε...
ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε... .

2:22-23

List ἅ ἐστιν πάντα...
ἅτινά ἐστιν... .

3:5-7

τὰ μελή List
οἱ ᾧ ἔρχεται...
ἐν οἷς...περιεπατήσατε... .

4:7-8

Τύχικος ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφός
πιστὸς διάκονος
σύνδουλος ἐν κυρίῳ
ὃν ἔπεμψα... .

4:10-11

'Αρίσταρχος	ὁ συναιχμάλωτός μου,
Μάρκος	ὁ ἀνεψιὸς Βαρναβᾶ,
	περὶ οὗ ἐλάβετε...
'Ιησοῦς	ὁ λεγόμενος 'Ιουστος,
	οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς
	οὗτοι μόνοι συνεργοί...,
	οἵτινες ἐγενήθησάν μοι παρηγορία.

The alternating of relative clauses and participles in 1:23 is illustrative of the author's consciousness of style.

We noted above that the frequency of the genitive case is a stylistic trait of Colossians. Related to that, is the fact that proportionately more relative clauses (13/45) resume genitival antecedents in Colossians than in any other epistle in the Corpus: 1:7, 14-18 (ter), 23 (ter), 24-25 (bis?), 29 (bis); 2:3, 17; 3:15. Colossians 1:29 and 2:3 are clearly examples of the resumption of an appositional genitive.

Third, that relative clauses manifesting the traits described above occur with great frequency throughout the epistle and in every type of material shows the consistency of the style of Colossians.

5. Summary Conclusions

A careful study of the style of Colossians shows that the sentences are not only long, but also consciously constructed. Probably no epistle in the Pauline Corpus,

with the possible exception of Ephesians, manifests more artfully constructed periods in so short a compass. The extended use of parallelism and the frequent alternating of equivalent constructions supports this conclusion.

The basic style of this epistle is descriptive, i.e. appositional and adjectival. This is not only indicated by the tendency to use appositives frequently and to employ multiple appositives, but also by the propensity for compounded synonyms, appositional genitives, and equative clauses. Only in very few cases (e.g. portions of 1:3-8, 24-29; 2:1-3) is the argument advanced by successive subordination, such as one finds regularly in Ephesians and in the Homologoumena.

The style of the epistle is consistent throughout. Almost all the traits which characterize its style are found in every section of Colossians. This is especially significant in consideration of the alleged use of hymnic characteristics often claimed to be found in these passages are common throughout Colossians.

Relative clauses occur with inordinate frequency in Colossians. In every way and in every section they are both consistent with and characterize the style of this epistle.

EXCURSUS II

THE STYLE OF EPHESIANS

1. The Problem

The analysis and description of the style of the Epistle to the Ephesians is exceedingly difficult and complex regardless of how one explains its origins or of how one ^xelicates its linguistic traits. Part of the problem, at least, results from the great difficulty any one has in determining just what the thrust of the argument is in this particular epistle. Perhaps part of the cause of the difficulty grows out of the fact that the well-known stylistic peculiarities of this text (e.g. its fondness for long clauses, parallel constructions, relative clauses, compounds and genitival constructions) misleads the student of its style. In addition, several factors which contribute to analytic problems of the scholar are themselves characteristics of the letter itself.

The first difficulty is the length of the sentences. At the beginning of the body of the epistle, the first sentence runs at least twelve verses (1:3-14 or 200+ words) and contains at least nineteen clause-level constructions. The second (1:15-21 /-23?/) is only slightly shorter. Even in the parenetic section (Chs. 4-6), where one normally expects short imperatival constructions, the sentences are often quite long and involved.¹

¹Cr. e.g. 4:11-16 (120+ words); 6:14-20 (nineteen clause-level constructions). There are almost no sentences in Ephesians without subordinate clauses (perhaps 4:7, 26,

A second factor which contributes to the complexity of the stylistic task is the marked change in subject matter and of certain stylistic traits between chapters 1-3 and 4-6 (i.e. the theological and ethical sections respectively) and to a lesser degree between chapters 1-2 and 3 (i.e. the former more sermonic, the latter more epistolary). Chapters 1 and 2 are primarily concerned with that which God in Christ Jesus has done for the believers (the newly baptized?); chapter 3 continues this emphasis, but with an accent on the writer's understanding of and means of obtaining this message.²

The difference in content between chapters 1-3 and chapters 4-6 is obvious to any reader. Even more striking, however, is the propensity of each of these sections to be marked by peculiar stylistic traits. Two of the more obvious linguistic tendencies of Ephesians are the frequent use of ἐν Χριστῷ or its equivalents³ and of the third person

27; 6:10. however, 4:26 and 27 and perhaps also 4:7 are actually compound sentences.

²The actor, either expressed or unexpressed, for most of the verbs in chapters 1-2 is θεός. On the other hand, most of the singular personal pronouns of the first person, of which Ephesians has a lower ratio than any of the Homologoumena, are in chapter 3 and the obviously epistolary plea in 6:19-21. Cf. also 4:1 and 1:16. The only exception is ἐγὼ εἰς λέγω which J. Paul Sampley has shown to be a traditional parenthetic formula.

³E.g. 1:3 ἐν Χριστῷ; 1:2 ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ; 1:4 ἐν αὐτῷ; 1:13 ἐν ᾧ; 2:21 ἐν κυρίῳ; 1:6 ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ; 2:13 ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

pronoun (αὐτός) in the singular.⁴ Although these constructions are found throughout Ephesians, both predominate in chapters 1-3 (26/31 and 30/37 respectively). In fact the former is found only three times in chapter 3 (vs. 6, 11, 21) and the most common form in the later chapters⁵ occurs only twice in the many uses of the formula in chapters 1-3 (1:15; 2:21).

The singular form of the personal pronoun αὐτός in the first three chapters is usually the genitive αὐτοῦ⁶ and these genitival forms almost invariably have θεός as the understood antecedent. The antecedent of the non-genitival forms is regularly Ἰησοῦς or Χριστός.⁷ This is in keeping with the facts that the understood actor with most of the verbs in the first three chapters is θεός (ὁμείζ in chapters 4-6) and that the subject matter is what has done in Christ Jesus.

Most of the numerous relative clauses and attributive participles (22/39 and 17/22 respectively) occur in

⁴E.g. 2:14 αὐτός; 1:4 αὐτοῦ; 1:20 αὐτόν. On the other hand, αὐτῷ in 3:22 is the only example of the dative singular of this pronoun without connecting preposition in this epistle.

⁵Εν κυρίῳ in 4:1, 17 and possible 5:19 (τῷ κυρίῳ).

⁶1:4, 5 (bis), 7 (bis), 9 (bis), 11, 12, 14, 17, 18 (bis), 19 (bis), 22 (quotation), 23; 2:4, 7, 14, 20; 3:7, 12, 15, 16. The only exceptions are αὐτός (2:14), αὐτῷ (3:22), αὐτόν (1:20, 22) and the formula ἐν αὐτῷ (1:4, 10, 11; 2:15, 16; 4:21).

⁷The exceptions are αὐτοῦ = Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (1:7, 22, 23; 2:14) and αὐτῷ = θεῷ (3:21).

the first three chapters while the last three show a preference for substantival (9/14) and predicative participles (34/60).⁸ The author's well-known propensity for genitival constructions is also manifest more commonly in the early chapters (30/47).⁹

On the other hand, many of the striking traits of the last three chapters are almost completely limited to that section. For example, most of the illustrations of the co-ordination of a negative with a succeeding positive statement, usually in the imperative, are found in these chapters.¹⁰ The author's fondness for indirect questions is manifested primarily in these same three chapters (1:18-19; 3:9, 18; 4:9; 5:11, 15, 17; 6:21), as is his love of compounds.

⁸ Interestingly there is a very heavy utilization of predicative participles in all the chapters except ch. 3: 1:5, 9, 11, 13 (bis), 15, 16 (bis), 18, 20 (bis); 2:1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 15 (bis), 16, 17, 20 (bis), 21; 3:4, 17 (bis); 4:3 (bis), 14, (bis), 15, 16 (bis), 18 (bis), 19, 25, 28, 32 (?); 5:10, 16, 19 (ter), 20, 21, 26, 27; 6:6, 7, 8, 9 (bis), 13, 14 (bis), 15, 16, 18 (bis).

Substantival participles are found in 1:6 (?), 11, 21, 23; 3:21; 4:10 (bis), 29; 5:12, 13, 14, 28.

Attributival participles are used in 1:3, 12, 19, 20; 2:2, 7, 11 (bis), 13, 14 (bis); 3:2, 7, 9 (bis), 19, 20; 4:18, 22, 24, 31; 6:16.

⁹ Cf. e.g. τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ in 1:5 or τὴν βουλήν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ in 1:11. Other examples are found in 1:7, 9, 10, 11, 13 (ter), 14 (ter), 17, 18 (bis), 19 (bis); 2:2 (bis), 3, 7; 3:2, 4, 7 (bis), 8, 10, 16, 19, 21; 4:3, 4, 7, 14 (bis), 16, 22, 23, 24; 5:2, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17 (bis), 19.

¹⁰ E.g. ὁ κλέπτων μηκέτι κλεπτέτω, μᾶλλον δὲ κοπιᾷτω... Cf. also 2:19-20; 4:17-25, 28, 29, 31-32; 5:3-4, 6-(8a/8b)-14, 11-12, 15, 17, 18-21, 29; 6:4, 6, 11-12.

In the last three chapters the author regularly includes an explanation or a justification for each command or prohibition in the form of either a comparative clause, stating the model,¹¹ or in the form of a causal clause giving the justification.¹² The inferential and adversative connectives, οὖν and δέ respectively, are the usual sentence transitions in this section and they, like γάρ, have not been weakened in the usual Pauline manner.¹³

The variation in style traits between chapters 1-2 and chapter 3 have been noted in the preceding paragraphs, i.e. chapter 3 has more epistolary traits, makes heavier use of the first person singular pronominal forms, and utilizes proportionately fewer ἐν Χριστῷ formulations, predicative participles and substantival participles.

A third factor, mentioned above, which complicates the problem of analysing the style of Ephesians, is that the

¹¹Cf. e.g. 5:3 καθὼς πρέπει ἁγίοις or 5:1 ὡς τέκνα ἀγαπητά or 5:4 ἃ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν. Καθὼς 1:4; 3:3; 4:4, 17, 20, 32; 5:2, 3, 25, 29. ὡς 2:3; 3:5; 5:1, 8, 15 (bis), 22, 23, 24, 26, 33; 6:5, 6 (bis), 7, 20. Cf. also 5:28.

¹²E.g. 4:25 ὅτι ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων or 5:5 τοῦτο γὰρ ὅτε γινώσκοντες... Ὅτι 4:25; 5:16, 23, 30; 6:12. Γάρ 5:5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 29; 6:1. Also εἰ γε in 4:20; διὰ τοῦτο 5:17; 6:13 (cf. also 5:6) and εἰδοτες in 6:8, 9. Often in the Homologoumena one has the feeling that γάρ has lost much of its causal force, becoming simply a means of moving the argument forward. Every example of this connective in Ephesians is clearly causal.

¹³Οὖν 2:19; 4:1, 17; 5:1, 7, 15; 6:14. Δέ 3:20; 4:7, 9, 31-32, 20; 5:3.

linguistic phenomena, which characterize the style of the epistle, mislead the scholar into supposing that it, like Colossians, has a basic coordinate or appositional style. The writer's fondness for compounds,¹⁴ appositives,¹⁵ long strings of prepositional phrases,¹⁶ adjectival

¹⁴1:1 τοῖς ἁγίοις--πιστοῖς, 1:2 θεοῦ-κυρίου 1:3 θεός-πατήρ, 1:4 ἁγίους-ἀμώμους, 1:8 σοφία-φρονήσει, 1:10 τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς-τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, 1:15 πιστὸν-ἀγάπῃ 1:18 three indirect interrogative clauses 1:20 ἐγείρας-καθίσας, 1:21 ἀρχῆς-ἐξουσίας-δυνάμεως-κυριότητος, 1:22 compound sentences, 2:1 παραπτώμασιν-ἁμαρτίαις, 2:3 ἀνεστράφημεν... ἡμεθα, 2:4-5 ὧν-ὄντας, 2:5-6 συνεζωοποίησεν-συνήγειρεν-συνεκάθισεν, 2:3 σαρκός-διανοιών, 2:12 ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι-ξένοι, 2:12 ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες-ἄθεοι, 2:14 ποιήσας-λύσας, 2:15-16 κτίσιν-ἀποκαταλλάξῃ, 2:19 ξένοι-παροικιοί, 2:19 συμπολιταὶ-οἰκεῖοι, 2:19 compound sentences, 2:20 ἀποστόλων-προφαιτῶν, and so consistently throughout Ephesians. A careful examination of the compound units above and the remaining seventy-five examples in the epistle will show that a smaller portion of the compounds are synonyms than was the case in Colossians, although the author of Ephesians does also multiply synonyms (e.g. 1:3, 4, 8, 21 et al).

¹⁵1:1 Παῦλος-ἀπόστολος, 2 θεοῦ-πατρός, 2 κυρίου-Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 3 κυρίου-Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 7 ἀπολύτρωσιν-ἄφεσιν 13 λόγον-εὐαγγέλιον 15 κυρίῳ-Ἰησοῦ, 17 θεός--πατήρ τῆς δόξης 23 ἐκκλησίᾳ-πλήρωμα. 2:2 ἄρχοντα(...)-πνεύματος, 14 τὸ μερότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ-τὴν ἐχθραν, 3:1 ἐγὼ-Παῦλος-δέσμιος, 1 ὑμῶν-ἐθνῶν 11 Χριστῷ-Ἰησοῦ-κυρίῳ, 8 ἐμοί-ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ, 4:1 ἐγὼ-δέσμιος 16 κεφαλῇ-Χριστός, 32 χρηστοί-εὐσπλαγχνοί-χαριζόμενοι 5:2 ἑαυτὸν-προσφορὰν-θυσίαν, 20 κυρίου-Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 6:21 Τύχιος-ἀδελφός-διάκονος, 23 θεοῦ-πατρός 23 κυρίου-Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 24 κύριον-Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν

¹⁶1:3 ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ 1:5 εἰς υἱοθεσίαν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς αὐτόν, κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ 1:11 κατὰ τὴν πρόθεσιν τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦντος κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης αὐτοῦ τοὺς προηλπικότες ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἐν ᾧ; such long strings of prepositional phrases are found in every chapter in the epistle and in each different kind of material.

constructions,¹⁷ and genitives,¹⁸ predilections all shared with the author of Colossians,¹⁹ has misled almost every known critic to discuss the use of parallelism and the so-called liturgical style of both Colossians and Ephesians. As we shall see below the style of Ephesians contrasts markedly with that of Colossians. Nonetheless the facts that (1) both manifest many of the same stylistic traits and (2) such critics as Holtzmann, Percy, and Schille have insisted on a clear relationship between the two make it advisable to compare the style of Colossians in the description of the style of Ephesians.

2. Self-conscious Style

The author of Ephesians, like the author of Colossians and in contrast to Paul, is quite self-conscious of style. His sentences are well-constructed and his style manifests rather clear patterns.

Ephesians 2:1-7 is one of the most carefully and artistically constructed periods in the New Testament:

καὶ ὑμᾶς

ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς
ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν,

¹⁷In addition to 36 relative clauses, all of which are adjectival, Ephesians contains 22 attributival, 60 predicative, and 14 substantival participles. These adjectival constructions are found in every section and in all types of material.

¹⁸See note 9 above.

¹⁹See Excursus I: The Style of Colossians and Its Relative Clauses, esp. pp. 87-92.

ἐν αἷς ποτε περιεπατήσατε κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ
κόσμου τούτου, κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ
ἀέρος, τοῦ πνεύματος

τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας·

ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες

ἀνεστράφημεν ποτε ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις
τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν,

ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς
καὶ τῶν διανοιῶν,

καὶ ἡμεθα τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς

ὥς καὶ οἱ λοιποί·

(καὶ ἡμᾶς) ὁ δὲ θεὸς

πλούσιος ὢν ἐν ἐλέει,

διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην αὐτοῦ

ἣν ἡγάπησεν ἡμᾶς,

καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν

(καί...θεὸς) συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ,

(χάριτί ἐστε σεσφσμένοι,)

καὶ συνήγειρεν

καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις
ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,

ἵνα ἐνδείξηται ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν

τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις

(ἵνα...αἰῶσιν) τὸ ὑπερβάλλον πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος
αὐτοῦ ἐν χρηστότητι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

This sentence is the most balanced one in Ephesians, but the
balanced use of subordinate constructions and coordination
is not unusual in this epistle.²⁰

²⁰Cf. for example the regularized use of coordina-
tion in the parenthetic section: 4:11-16, 20-24, 26, 27, 28,
29, etc.

Not only does the author strive in his own way for balance, he also moves in almost every sentence toward a telic or consequential construction. The telic conjunction ἵνα is used much more frequently in proportion in Ephesians (23x) than in any other epistle in the corpus except II Corinthians and Colossians. Many sentences end with such constructions.²¹ In addition to the sentences which end in telic constructions, the writer regularly concludes units in his longer sentences with telic constructions which are continued by later constructions always subordinate to these telic clauses.²² Although telic constructions occur almost as frequently per page in Colossians as they do in Ephesians, Colossians in no way manifests that pattern which predominates in the sentences of Ephesians.

Additional evidence of this careful stylizing of sentences is to be found in the parenthesis in the coordination

²¹All the following examples are introduced by ἵνα unless otherwise noted: 1:14 (εἰς 2); 2:7, 9, 10, 18, 22 (εἰς); 3:15-19 (ἵνα clause containing two infinitives and two ἵνα clauses, one of which contains two additional telic infinitives); 4:3 (inf.), 10, 13, 16 (εἰς), 24 (ἐν phrase--perhaps also 3 compound infinitives), 28, 29; 5:2 (εἰς), 25-27 (three successively subordinate ἵνα clauses); 6:3, 11 (πρός and infinitive), 13, 16 (relative clause), 19-20 (compound ἵνα clauses), 22.

²²E.g., 1:4 (εἶναι), 10 (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι), 12 (εἰς τὸ εἶναι), 17, 18 (εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι); 2:15; 3:4 (?πρός 8...), 6 (εἶναι), 8-9 (εὐαγγελισθαι--φωτίσαι), 10 (ἵνα), 12 (? μέχρι), 13 (3 εἰς phrases), 33; 6:21 is the only ἵνα clause in the epistle which precedes the main clause; in fact it is one of the few subordinate constructions of any kind so preced its head clause.

of negative and positive statements, and the use of comparative and causal explications (usually well-balanced), as well as the way successive clauses are tied together.²³ Thus, on the basis of all of this evidence (i.e. the artfully constructed periods, the use of telic constructions, the careful construction of the parenesis), one must necessarily conclude that the author of Ephesians is self-conscious of style, even if his style is quite different from that of the author of Colossians.

3. Basic Style--Successive Subordination

Successive subordination at every linguistic level is the basic characteristic of the style of Ephesians. In this basic characteristic it differs unmistakably from Colossians, with which it shares so many stylistic traits, and is much more like Paul's usual cause-effect style. However, in this trait it differs from the Homologoumena also in that subordination is more frequent, consistent and intensive, and that the subordinated constructions are much longer than is usual in any epistle among the accepted letters. This tendency of Ephesians to be more Pauline in style than Colossians is made even more remarkable by the fact that one can easily discern the aim and argument of the latter; although intensively and extensively made, the thrust of the

²³ Negative--Positive combinations are discussed in note 10 above, comparative clauses in note 11 and causal explications in note 12. The bridging of successively subordinate clauses will be discussed below in the next section.

argument in Ephesians still eludes scholars.

The argument of the entire Ephesian epistle moves from cause to effect, as an examination of the transitions between sentences and paragraphs shows clearly. The sentence connectives are carefully chosen and they are regularly either consequential or causal (when not καί) and are usually used with undiminished force.²⁴

Not only are the sentences consequentially related to each other in succession, but also most of the clause-level constructions within any sentence are successively subordinate. An indented diagram of the sentence in 2:10 provides a simple illustration of this:

αὐτοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν ποίημα,
 κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς,
 οἷς προητοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς
 ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν.

Notice that γάρ connects the main clause causally to the preceding statement that "we are not saved by our works lest anyone should have grounds for boasting." The participial phrase, introduced by κτισθέντες, is subordinate too and explains the allegation that "we are his work." The relative phrase οἷς resumes that ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς at the end of the participial phrase. The telic clause, introduced

²⁴ διὰ τοῦτο (1:15; 5:17). γάρ (2:8, 10, 14; 5:5, 6, 8, 12). διό (2:11; 3:13; 4:8, 25; 5:14). ἅρα οὖν (2:19). τοῦτου χάριν (3:1, 14). ὥστε (3:20; 4:7, 9, 20, 32; 5:3). οὖν (4:1, 17; 5:1, 7, 15; 6:14). ἀντὶ τοῦτο (5:31). πλὴν (5:33).

by ἵνα, does not give the purpose of the main clause but rather explains why God prepared before hand the good works.

This same kind of subordination occurs in the prayer in 1:3-14 presented in abbreviated form below:

εὐλόγητος ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ...,

ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ...ἐν Χριστῷ,

καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς...,

εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους...ἐν ἀγάπῃ

προορίσας ἡμᾶς...διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,...
εἰς ἑπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ,

ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς

ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ,

ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν...κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος
τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ,

ἧς ἐπερίσσευσεν...

γνωρίσας...εὐδοκίαν...,

ἣν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ...,

ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ
πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ,... .

The sentence in 1:3-14 continues for another four verses through a series of eleven successively subordinate clause-level structures. Because it is dominated by a series of relative clauses it will be discussed below.²⁵

The relationship of the successively subordinate clauses of 1:3-10 above is quite interesting and indicative of the style of the epistle. The head clause and the succeeding attributival participial phrase are bound together

²⁵See pages 123-124.

not only as head and attribute, but also by the triple utilization of the εὐλογε- stem and the repetition of τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in ἐν Χριστῷ. The comparative clause is bound to its head, an attributival participle, by a subordinating conjunction, the repetition of ἡμᾶς and the resumption of ἐν Χριστῷ in ἐν αὐτῷ. These three clauses come to a conclusion in a telic construction introduced by εἶναι and repeating ἡμᾶς. The telic construction is subordinate to the comparative clause and not to the whole sentence. The idea of election before the foundation of the world is resumed in the predicative participle προορίσας and in this phrase διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is obviously the equivalent of ἐν Χριστῷ. This loosely constructed participial phrase (v. 5) is not just followed by a relative clause, but by one which repeats the antecedent in the stem of the verb (χάριτος- ἥς ἐχαρίτωσεν...). The introductory ἐν ᾧ (v. 7) resumes the ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ at the end of this clause and the clause repeats the χαριτ- stem of the head clause. This series of successively subordinated and interrelated clauses comes to a second telic break in the construction introduced by the infinitive ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι.

The same basic style of successive subordination is also found in the parenesis as an abbreviated diagram of 5:25-28 will show:

οἱ ἄνδρες

ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας,

καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἡγάπησεν... παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς,

ἵνα αὐτὴν ἀγιάσῃ

καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι,

ἵνα παραστήσῃ...ἐνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν,

μὴ ἔχουσιν σπίλον...,

ἀλλ' ἵνα ᾗ ἀγία καὶ ἄμωμος.

οὕτως ὀφείλουσιν καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες ἀγαπᾶν...γυναῖκας

ὡς τὰ ἑαυτοῦ σώματα. (ὁ ἀγαπῶν...ἑαυτὸν ἀγαπᾷ.)

οὐδεὶς γάρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα ἐμίσησεν,... .

The above diagrams and analyses of the inter-relationships of the clause in Ephesians 2:10; 1:3-10; and 5:25-28 are not exhaustive, but they do serve to illustrate the ways in which the writer both constructs his long sentences and interrelates the various subordinate clauses. While the sentences are generally longer in chapters 1-3, this successive subordination of clause-level constructions is equally characteristic of thanksgiving, theological, epistolary and parenthetic sections of this epistle.²⁶

Even at a phrase level the writer follows his penchant for successive subordination. His fondness for genitival constructions, especially abstract nouns used as genitives of definition, is one manifestation of this.²⁷ These genitives are roughly equivalent to appositives in

²⁶Cf. e.g. 2:14-16; 3:8-13; 4:11-16; 6:5-8.

²⁷Cf. note 9 above.

Ephesians as in Colossians. Yet, in Ephesians, the appositional effect on style is muted by the frequency with which the succeeding subordinate clause is related to the concluding genitive.²⁸

Another illustration of this successive subordination is the author's predilection for long lists of prepositional phrases. Some of these groups of prepositional phrases are probably parallel to each other:²⁹ and, therefore, not successively subordinate. However, in most cases each prepositional phrase qualifies the preceding phrase and not the whole clause.³⁰

This style of successive subordination, which contrasts so strikingly with Colossians' appositional style, is made even more remarkable by the fact that these two epistles share so many stylistic traits. Both use ἐν Χριστῷ formulations more extensively than any epistle in the Homologoumena; in this case the heaviest use is in Ephesians. Both utilize adjectival constructions with a greater than usual frequency-- in this case Colossians makes a comparatively greater use of

²⁸1:5, 7: χάριτος ἧς..., 9 τοῦ θελήματος..., κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν... ἡν..., and elsewhere. In other cases, such as 3:2, 7 and 1:19, the substantive defined by the genitive is resumed in the succeeding subordinate clause.

²⁹E.g., perhaps κατὰ εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ and εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ (1:5); κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου and κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ αἰῶρος... (2:2); εἰς τὴν ἐνότητα τῆς πίστεως... εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον and εἰς μέτρον... (4:13).

³⁰Strings of two or more successive prepositional phrases are found in each of the following verses: 1:3, 4a, 4b, 5, 8, 10, 14, 20; 2:2, 6, 7, 10, 11, 15, 16, 21, 22; 3:12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 21; 4:2, 12a, 12b, 13, 14, 16a, 16b, 19, 31; 5:18, 26; 6:5, 18a, 18b, 19, 22, 23.

relative clauses, adjectives and predicate participles.

In fact, the predicative participles in the parenetic section of Colossians are used in ways analogous to the comparative clauses in the same section of Ephesians. On the other hand Ephesians employs attributival and especially substantival participles more frequently than Colossians.

The thing which makes the contrast in styles most remarkable is that the authors of each have a marked penchant for compounds and appositives. Both employ compound constructions more often than is normal in the Homologoumena, with Ephesians in this case being the more extreme. Nonetheless, there are noticeable differences. The words and phrases compounded in Ephesians are less frequently appositives or synonyms.³¹ Even more important Ephesians much less frequently coordinates two or more clause level constructions. Thus the paralleling of compound relative clauses, relative clauses and participial constructions, so common in Colossians, is much less frequent in Ephesians.³² This lack of

31

Exceptions: 1:1 ἁγίοις-πιστοῖς ; 1:3 θεός-πατήρ; 1:4 ἁγίους-ἀμώμους ; 1:20 ἀρχῆς-ἐξουσίας-δυνάμεως-κυριότητος ; 2:1 παραπτώμασιν-ἁμαρτίαις ; 2:12 ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι-ξένοι ; 2:19 ξένοι-πάροικοι, συμπολῖται-οἰκεῖοι ; 3:12 παρρησίαν-προσαγωγήν ; 4:17 λέγω-μαρτύρομαι ; and a few others scattered throughout the epistle.

32

1:16-17 (two supplementary participial phrases asyndeton), 18-19 (three indirect questions used as under-
poers--the first two asyndeton), 20 (two predicative participial phrases); 2:1 (predicative participle and prepositional phrase asyndeton), 11-12 (two ἵνα substantival clauses asyndeton); 3:9 (two infinitives of purpose), 16-19 (two infinitives of purpose and two ἵνα clauses asyndeton), 18-19 (two infinitives of purpose asyndeton); 4:2-3 (two predicative participles asyndeton),

clause-level parallelism is a major factor in the difference in style between the two epistles.

A second factor is the contrasting frequency and utilization of appositives. On a continuum from the proportionately least frequent to the most numerous use of appositives, Ephesians would rank lower than Colossians and much closer to the norm in the Homologoumena. Furthermore, in keeping with the style of Ephesians, if a word has both an appositive^{it} and not the word it is in apposition with is qualified by the adjectival clause.³²

Thus it becomes plain that, although Ephesians and Colossians share many stylistic traits (construction types which may be found in the Homologoumena, although not usually as frequent or as long) the styles of the two epistles are significantly different. Colossians is appositional in style--Ephesians is marked throughout by successively subordination as the author progressively moves from cause to

22-24 (three infinitives with one connective); 5:19-21 (three participial phrases asyndeton); 6:14-16 (four participial phrases), 18-19 (two participial phrases), 19-20 (two ὅτι clauses asyndeton). Compound sentences and compounds below a clause level have been omitted from this list. Ernest Percy, Die Probleme der Kolosser--und Epheserbriefe (Lund, 1946), pp. 21-26 discusses the frequent use of asyndeton in series of cola introduced by prepositions, a tendency more pronounced in Ephesians than in Colossians, but he does not deal with clause-level constructions connected asyndeton.

³²1:10 ἐν Χριστῷ...ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν ᾧ....
 1:23 τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ...τὸ σῶμα, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ...πληρουμένου;
 2:2 τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἁγίου, τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν
 ἐνεργοῦντος...; 4:16 αὐτός...κεφαλὴ, Χριστός, ἐξ οὗ...;
 4:22 κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφήν τὸν παλαῖον ἄνθρωπον
 τὸν φθειρόμενον... .

effect in his argument.

4. Consistency of Style

At the beginning of this excursus much was made of the variations in linguistic traits in the distinguishable sections of the Epistle. To what degree, if any, is the style of the epistle unified? This question is crucial because it has often been alleged that certain portions, especially sections of chapters 1 and 2, are liturgical materials incorporated by the author into this epistle. If this is the case and if it can be demonstrated that those sections differ in style and linguistic traits from the remainder of the epistle, then a strong argument can be made for identifying the liturgical fragments. Also if the peculiar characteristics of Ephesians are most frequently found in the alleged traditional materials, then arguments against the authenticity of the epistle itself have been significantly weakened.

Is the style of Ephesians consistent? In spite of the waxing and waning of particular linguistic traits, the answer must be "yes". In the first place, the basic characteristic of successive subordination is true throughout-- in the thanksgiving section of chapter 1, the kerygmatic or doctrinal material in chapter 2, the epistolary materials of chapters 3 and 6, and the parenetic materials in chapters 4-6. It is no more nor no less prevalent in the alleged hymnic materials in 1:7-14. It is less prevalent in the parenthesis, because the sentences are somewhat shorter there, although

subordination is more common there than in the usual Pauline parenesis. The parenesis does continue the careful use of consequential and causal connectives and the so-called Haustafeln (5:25-6:9) makes extensive use of successive subordination.

Second, the linguistic traits which wax in some sections and wane in others are never peculiar to any section. 'Εν Χριστῷ formulations, αὐτός, -οῦ in the singular, attributival participles, genitives of definition, all of which by their frequency of appearance characterize the first three chapters, are found in every section of the epistle. The same is also true of causal constructions with γάρ or ὅτι, substantival and predicative participles, compound constructions above a word level, and the coordination of negative and positive statements, all of which characterize the last three chapters.

Third, there are many linguistic traits, characteristic of the style of Ephesians, which are rather consistent throughout the epistle. The propensity for long sentences, asyndeton, long genitival phrases, argumentative connectives between sentences, extended prepositional phrases, purpose constructions, appositives, and compounds has been discussed above. Examples of these phenomena are found with striking consistency throughout the epistle, each section having about the same proportion. The alleged liturgical fragments do not differ at this point.

One of the more obvious traits of the style of Ephesians is the extraordinary frequency with which the author ends a colon with a dative, usually governed by *ἐν*.³⁴ This phenomenon is more frequent here than in Colossians, which manifests this phenomenon more often than the Homologoumena. A careful examination of the evidence here presented will show that cola ending in dative constructions are found with great consistency throughout the epistle.

For these reasons the conclusions that the style of Ephesians is consistent and that there is no internal evidence, as yet, to identify traditional fragments, are necessary.

5. Ephesians, Colossians, and the Question of Hymnic Style

Since Eduard Norden's Agnostos Theos, it has been generally accepted that certain portions of Colossians, namely (1) 1:15-20 and (2) perhaps 1:12-14, were fragments of or at least imitated the style of pre-Pauline Jewish-Christian Christological hymns. Almost equally strong

³⁴1:3 ἐν Χριστῷ, 4 ἐν ἀγάπῃ, 6 ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ, 8 ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονήσει, 12 ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, 17 ἐν ἐπιγνώσει..., 18 ἐν τοῖς ἀγίοις, 19 ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, 21a ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι.... Also in 2:3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 21, 22; 3:3, 4, 6, 9, 11, 17; 4:1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 13, 15, 16a, 16b, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24; 5:2, 3, 5, 8a, 9, 18, 20, 21, 24; 6:1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18a, 18b, 19a, 19b, 20, 21, 24. The writer of Ephesians frequently ends clause-level constructions in the epistle with the simple dative (cf. e.g. 1:13; 2:1, 5a, 5b; 3:5; 5:6, 11, 19, among others.

has been the contention that Ephesians 1:3-14 (at least 1:7-14) is a primitive hymn to God. The major argument for this has been based on style. In fact G. Schille goes so far as to claim a liturgically-shaped style for all of Ephesians. To what degree has this study of the style of Ephesians and the preceding one on Colossians confirmed or denied this contention?

Ernst Percy has already shown that many of the individual stylistic traits, i.e., fondness for genitives, appositives, adjectival clauses, long series of prepositions, synonyms, are found quite frequently in ancient hymnic materials.³⁵ This is undeniable. But further we cannot go.

In fact, a very serious question is posed by the study to date. The alleged hymnic materials in both Colossians and Ephesians are in no way stylistically distinct from the epistolary content in which they occur. If each fragment matches in style its context and if the two epistles are quite different in style, then how can both represent hymnic style?

6. Relative Clauses and the Style of Ephesians

Ephesians makes extended use of relative clauses (39), as well as attributival (22), substantival (14) and predicative (60) participles. This, coupled with frequent appositives, genitives of definition and compound synonyms,

³⁵ Percy, Op. cit., pp. 38-42.

leads one to expect an appositional or descriptive style. This is not the case, however. The style of Ephesians is one of an almost invariable successive subordination with each clause often related to the concluding phrase of its immediate predecessor.

The degree to which this trait of successive subordination is characteristic of the relative clauses of Ephesians can be seen in the following abbreviated diagram of the relative clauses in 1:6-14:

...εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ,

ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ,

ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος,
τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων, κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος
τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ,

ἧς ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ
φρονήσει

γνωρίσας ἡμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος
αὐτοῦ, κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ,

ἣν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ
πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν,

ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ
Χριστῷ,...

ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐκληρώθημεν

προορισθέντες κατὰ...κατὰ...,

εἰς τὸ εἶναι...ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ·

ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς,

ἀκούσαντες...τὸ εὐαγ-
γέλιον ...,

ἐν ᾧ καὶ

πιστεύσαντες

(ἐν ᾧ καὶ) ἐσφραγίσ-
θητε τῷ πνεύματι...,

ὅς ἐστιν ἀρραβὼν
...εἰς ἔπαινον
τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.

Few passages in the New Testament, if any, utilize so many (8) relative clauses in so short a compass. A survey shows that all eight, with the possible exception of ἐν ᾧ in 1:13b, are adjectival with expressed antecedents. The antecedents are regularly articular nouns standing in the last phrase of the preceding head construction. In the one example in which the antecedent is separated from the relative clause, i.e. ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ in 1:12, the antecedent is resumed by a pleonastic ἐν αὐτῷ immediately before the relative (ἐν ᾧ -13a).

It is remarkable that in a sentence containing eight relative clauses, as well as three attributival, one substantival and five predicative participial phrases, none are parallel to equivalent constructions. The only possible exception (in fact, the only possible parallel relative clause in the whole epistle) is 1:13b; ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες... . However, the facts that 13a is an anacoluthon and that in every other case in the epistle places the antecedent at the end of the clause immediately preceding, argue that ἐν ᾧ καὶ... in 1:13b is subordinate to the clause introduced by the relative in 1:13a.

It is also noteworthy that the author, following

a style trait noted earlier,³⁶ breaks this sentence into several parts at least five and perhaps seven) by the use of telic and related constructions. This tends to make the remainder of the sentence which follows the telic construction be only loosely related (subordinated) to the earlier portion of the sentence. In Ephesians 1:3-14 the dominant telic construction is εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ (1:5, 12, 14),³⁷ but infinitives are used in 1:4 and 1:10. Since the sentence is resumed by a relative clause after each of these telic breaks (except v. 5 where προορίσας resumes), the relative in the succeeding relative clauses (1:6, 11, 13a and, by analogy, 13b) functions more as a pronominal transition than as a subordinating relator. The relative clauses after such telic constructions is almost the head clause of a new independent sentence. This same phenomenon, which is peculiar in our corpus to Ephesians, is also found in those cases when the antecedent is located in a loosely connected phrase introduced by κατὰ (e.g. 1:7-8).

Those statements which are particularly true about the eight relative clauses in 1:3-14 are also true about all the relative clauses of Ephesians. They are all consistent with stylistic pattern of successive subordination in the epistle. All are adjectival, having expressed antecedents.

³⁶Excursus II, pp. 110.

³⁷1:13a following the pattern of vs. 3-5, 11-12, and 13b-14 probably should be assumed to end in εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.

The antecedents are usually articular nouns and in every case they precede the relative immediately. Only one (6:22, a sentence already shown to be different from other sentences in the epistle) resumes an antecedent which is also qualified by an appositive: "ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε... Τύχικος ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς διάκονος ἐν κυρίῳ, ὃν ἔπεμψα...."

In every other case in which either a relative clause or an attributival participle occurs in the same construction with appositional constituents, the relative or participle resumes the appositive.³⁸ In this practice the relative clauses of Ephesians stand in marked contrast to those of Colossians.

Although Ephesians makes extensive use of genitives, the number of relative clauses resuming genitival antecedents is not larger than one would expect in the Homologoumena.³⁹ On the other hand the number of antecedents governed by prepositions (16), especially by ἐν (7) and κατὰ (3) is disproportionately large but, nonetheless, in keeping with the frequency of prepositional phrases at the end of clauses in the epistle.

7. Summary Conclusions

The very long sentences and clauses in Ephesians are carefully and consciously constructed. In fact some of

³⁸Cf. Excursus II, p. 118, note 32.

³⁹1:6, 8; 3:6; 4:1. Contrast the seven in Colossians.

the most artistically constructed sentences in the New Testament are found in this epistle. In addition sentence units move regularly to telic conclusions.

A thorough-going employment of successive subordination is the basic trait of that style. This is manifested by (1) the careful use of causal, inferential and adversative connectives between sentences, (2) the subordination of almost every clause to the one immediately before it, and (3) the heavy utilization of genitives and prepositional phrases, usually successively subordinate. This basic style of the epistle is made more noteworthy by the fact that the linguistic peculiarities of it, most of which are shared with Colossians to a greater or lesser degree, would lead us (in fact, have led most scholars) to expect a descriptive or appositional style, marked by much coordination and parallelism.

Although certain frequently appearing phenomena wax and wane in the various sections of the epistle, the over-all style is astonishingly consistent throughout. In fact, no other epistle in the entire Paul Corpus is so thoroughly consistent in sentence style. This very consistency of style calls into question attempts to identify traditional hymnic fragments (1:3-14) on the basis of stylistic criteria and the question is made more difficult by the marked contrasts between the style of Ephesians and other so-called liturgical fragments in Colossians (1:15-20; 2:10-12).

Ephesians uses adjectival clause-level structures more frequently than does the average Homologoumenon. This is especially true of relative clauses, although the use is not as proportionately frequent as in Colossians. In every way and in every section the relative clauses of Ephesians are both consistent with and characterize the style of this epistle.

CHAPTER II

THE RELATIVES OF THE PAULINE CORPUS

Introduction

Any word-level analysis of the relatives of the Pauline Corpus must deal effectively with the following questions: (1) How and when, if at all, are the three relatives (i.e. ὅς, ὅστις, and ὅσοις) distinguished from each other? (2) What particles are used with the relatives (i.e. affect the meaning of the relative) and under what conditions? (3) How often and under what conditions do Constructio ad Sensum, attraction and inverse attraction occur? (4) What are the distribution patterns for the various relatives, relative forms, and relative functions? (5) When do relatives introduce independent sentences and what relatives are so used? (6) Under what conditions do relatives function as adverbial connectives? These are the questions most frequently treated by prescriptive grammarians, although the treatments are seldom as analytical and descriptive as this chapter seeks to be.

A second set of questions must be answered, if the evidence gleaned at a word-level is to be of any value in determining the authenticity of any of the Pauline Antilegomena: (7) In answering the first six questions, are the patterns discovered consistently employed throughout the Homologoumena? (8) Are there patterns which seem to be peculiarly characteristic of the Pauline idiom? (9) Do the

same patterns (i.e. #7 and #8) occur in the same ways in the various Antilegomena? These last three questions have not been treated heretofore by any scholar.

All nine questions deal with matters which may reflect a particular author's style and, as a consequence, all have possible relevance to questions of authenticity.

A. THE RELATIVES OF THE HOMOLOGOUMENA

A word-level analysis of the relatives of the Homologoumena makes clear that these epistles manifest quite consistent and describable patterns of use, distribution, and variation of relatives throughout. For example, most of the relative idioms found in any epistle are found in three or more epistles; also any answer to the first six questions in the introduction which applies to one epistle in the Homologoumena usually applies to them all. Naturally the evidence for such assertions must be spelled out explicitly.

1. Are There One, Two or Three Relatives?

Most grammars treat ὅς, ὅστις and ὅσοις as three separate relative pronouns or relative adjectives. While admittedly absolute distinctions were seldom maintained in any period, it is common place among grammarians to treat ὅς as the definite relative (i.e. resumes a definite antecedent), ὅστις as the indefinite relative (i.e. resumes an indefinite antecedent or else characterizes the antecedent), and ὅσοις as a quantitative relative adjective. Even when

recognizing that these distinctions are often blurred, such grammarians have generally claimed that the distinctions were maintained in the Pauline Corpus.¹ Nonetheless, H. J. Cadbury's proof that the author of Acts knows no distinction between ὅς and ὅστις (and probably none between ὅς/ὅστις and ὅσοι),² as well as Nigel Turner's assertion that there is no distinction between ὅς and ὅστις in the Pauline Corpus,³ requires that the relationship between the

¹Cf. discussion and survey of literature in A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Nashville, 1934), pp. 726-728. J. H. Moulton asserts "that the two relatives are never absolutely convertible, however blurred may be the outlines of the classical distinction in Luke, and possible in sporadic passages outside his writings." (J. H. Moulton, Prolegomena. Vol I of A Grammar of New Testament Greek, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh, 1908), p. 92). According to Robertson (p. 726), Blass claimed that the distinction was best maintained in Paul. However, in the current edition (F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, Robert W. Funk, ed. & trans. (Chicago; 1961), para. 293, 4) it is claimed that the distinction, in Rom 16:3ff. at least, is between simple assertion and characteristic. C. F. D. Moule, An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1959), pp. 123-4, after reviewing H. J. Cadbury's arguments, desires to maintain the distinction, claiming that there are several passages (including Rom 6:2; 9:4; II Cor 8:10), in which "it is possible to argue that...a distinction certainly improves the sense and may have been intended." The subjective nature of this judgment is obvious.

²Henry J. Cadbury, "The Relative Pronouns in Acts and Elsewhere," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLII (1923), pp. 150-157. Cadbury applies the same tests to Acts that are applied in this chapter to the Homologoumena, with one exception: He does not consider the possibility that hostis may introduce a clause giving a characteristic (Cf. Blass-Debrunner, Op. cit., para. 293, 4).

³Nigel Turner, Syntax. Vol III: A Grammar of New Testament Greek (Edinburgh, 1963), p. 47. Turner says that Cadbury's conclusions also apply to Paul, but he only cites Rom 16:3ff. as evidence without comment. The same

relatives be examined afresh.

A careful analysis of all of the relatives of the Homologoumena in the contexts in which they occur shows conclusively that ὅς and ὅστις are a single relative and that there is no lexical or syntactical distinction between them. In fact, only a stylistic difference remains in those sentences in which both refer to the same antecedent. (1) The distribution of the forms of both ὅς and ὅστις as well as the employment of both, (2) to resume indefinite antecedents, (3) to qualify or characterize general groups, and (4) in equivalent or parallel clauses all confirm this conclusion.

The Distribution of the Relatives argues that ὅστις has become the dominant nominative form of ὅς, as Table V at the top of the next page will show.⁴ The important observations from such a charting of this distribution are too plain to miss. (1) All of the nominative forms of ὅστις appear, but only the nominative forms appear. If this relative has a distinct lexical function, then some explanation must be given for the fact that it appears only in the nominative. (2) All of the forms of ὅς appear except the feminine nominative singular (ἥ), the feminine nominative plural (αἱ), the neuter nominative plural (ἃ), and certain

conclusions are reached for Koine Greek in general by Albert Schwyzer, Syntax und Syntaktische Stilistik. Vol II: Griechische Grammatik (München, 1959), p. 643.

⁴Following the practice in contemporary linguistics, only those forms of the three relatives are listed on the table which also are found in the Homologoumena.

TABLE V

DISTRIBUTION OF THE THREE RELATIVES

	<u>Masculine</u>			<u>Feminine</u>			<u>Neuter</u>		
Nom	ὁς/ ὅστις	/--		--/ ἥτις	/--		ὅ / ὅτι	/--	
Sg	42	2	0	0	8	0	9	2	0
Gen	οὗ/	--	/--	ἧς/	--	/--	οὗ/	--	/--
Sg	14	0	0	2	0	0	8	0	0
Dat	ᾧ /	--	/--	ᾧ /	--	/--	ᾧ /	--	/--
Sg	10	0	0	8	0	0	16	0	0
Acc	ὃν/	--	/--	ἣν/	--	/--	ὅ /	--	/--
Sg	17	0	0	12	0	0	39	0	0
Nom	οἱ/οἵτινες/ὅσοι			--/αἵτινες/ὅσαι			--/ἅτινα/ὅσα		
Pl	1	11	9	0	1	1	0	3	7
Gen	ᾧν/	--	/--	ᾧν/	--	/--	ᾧν/	--	/--
Pl	11	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0
Dat	οἷς/	--	/--	--/	--	/--	οἷς/	--	/--
Pl	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Acc	οὓς/	--	/--	--/	--	/--	ἃ /	--	/ὅσα
Pl	10	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	1

other feminine plural forms.⁵ The only occurrence of the masculine nominative plural (οἱ) is in Romans 16:7b, where it is parallel to a clause introduced by οἵτινες:

ἀσπάσασθε Ἀνδρόνικον καὶ Ἰουνιᾶν τοὺς συγγενεῖς...,
οἵτινές εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις,
οἳ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ.

(3) It is exactly those forms of ὅς most easily confused with the definite article which are missing from its declension. Even more striking is the circumstance that it is exactly the corresponding forms of ὅστις (and ὅσος) which are most frequent. This evidence suggests, as the likely hypothesis, that ὅστις has generally replaced ὅς in the nominative to avoid confusing the relative pronouns and the definite article.

The Relative Used with Indefinite Antecedents

furnishes additional evidence that ὅς and ὅστις are actually one relative, i.e. that there is no lexical and syntactical difference between them. Although it is difficult to ascertain which antecedents were conceived as indefinite by the author,⁶ the following are examples of indefinite relative

⁵The relative absence of feminine plural forms is characteristic of all of the pronouns in this Corpus. Cf. Robert Morgenthaler, Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes (Zürich, 1958), pp. 158-159.

⁶Ernest de Witt Burton, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh, 1898), pp. 116-117. In this section, Burton points out that the distinction between definite and indefinite (1) relates not to the relatives but to the antecedents, (2) has nothing to do with the state of the antecedent, but only with how the

clauses in the Homologoumena:

Philippians 2:15

...γένησθε ἀμεμπτοὶ καὶ ἀκέραιοι, τέκνα θεοῦ. ἅμωμα μέσον γενεᾶς σκολιᾶς καὶ διεστραμμένης,

ἐν οἷς φαίνεσθε ὡς φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ.

Galatians 6:7

ὁ γὰρ ἐὰν σπεῖρῃ ἄνθρωπος,
τοῦτο καὶ θερίσει.

II Corinthians 11:21

ἐν ᾧ δ' ἂν τις τολμᾷ,
...τολμῶ καὶ γώ.

II Corinthians 11:4

εἰ...ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν κηρύσσει
ὃν οὐκ ἐκηρύξαμεν...

Philippians 3:7

ἅτινα ἦν μοι κέρδη,
ταῦτα ἤγημαι διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν ζημίαν.

author viewed it, and (3) is seldom discernible from the form of the construction. His conclusion that the distinction finally is a matter of how the author thought of or conceived the antecedent, simply emphasizes the difficulty that one has in identifying the indefinite relative clauses of the Homologoumena.

Nonetheless, the relative clauses listed in Appendix IV seem to have indefinite antecedents. Although particular examples in that list may be disputed by scholars who make conflicting exegetical decisions, a number sufficient to prove the case in this chapter would generally be accepted as indefinite.

Unless otherwise noted (e.g. ὅστις, ὅστις ἐάν, ὅστις οὐ, ὅς ἂν, ὅς ἐάν, ὅς οὐ, ὅς μή, ὅσος and ὅσος οὐ the relative clauses are positive and the simple relative (i.e. ὅς) introduces each one.

Galatians 5:10

ὁ δὲ ταράσσων ὑμᾶς βαστάσει τὸ κρίμα,
ὅστις ἐάν ᾖ.

Romans 6:3

ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν,
εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν.

Even a conservative estimate indicates that the frequency with which Paul resumed indefinite antecedents with relative clauses is a mark of Pauline style.⁷

The 114 relative clauses safely indentifiable as indefinite possess regular introductory relative idioms. Approximately the same proportions of ὅς and ὅστις are indefinite (92/228 and 8/25 respectively). All of the relative clauses containing the particles ἄν⁸ and ἐάν,⁹ as well as all of those introduced by some form of ὅσος,¹⁰ are indefinite. The distribution of indefinite relative clauses and of the introductory idioms of such clauses is

⁷A conservative estimate would indicate that as many as 114/252 antecedents of Pauline relative clauses were indefinite. Of these 114, 69 are introduced by the simple relative (ὅς), 5 by ὅς οὐ and 3 each by ὅς ἄν and ὅς ἐάν. Twenty-three (23) are introduced by ὅσος and this number constitutes all of the ὅσος clauses in the Homologoumena. Eight (8) are introduced by ὅστις and an additional three by ὅστις ἐάν. Neither ὅς μή nor ὅστις μή occur.

⁸Rom 16:2; I Cor 11:27; II Cor 11:21.

⁹I Cor 6:18; 16:2, 3; Gal 5:17; 6:7.

¹⁰Rom 2:12a, 12b; 3:19; 6:3; 7:1; 8:14; 11:13; 15:4; I Cor 7:39a; II Cor 1:20; Gal 3:10, 27; 4:1; 6:12, 16; Phl 3:15; 4:8a, 8b, 8c, 8d, 8e, 8f.

proportionate throughout the Homologoumena.

The Qualitative Use of "ὅστις", i.e. to indicate the class or kind to which the antecedent belongs¹¹ or to emphasize a characteristic quality,¹² is often claimed as a distinguishing function of this relative maintained by Paul. Among the claimed examples of this distinctive usage are:

Romans 1:25

διὸ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν

τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς.

οἵτινες μετέλλαξαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει, καὶ ἐσεβάσθησαν καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, ...

Romans 2:15

οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσιν νόμος·

οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, ...

Romans 6:2

οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ,

πᾶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ;

¹¹

According to A. T. Robertson (Op. cit., p. 727) W. F. Moulton's translation of Winer's Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms (p. 209, n. 3) defines ὅστις as properly indicating the class or kind to which something belongs. Cf. also Smyth, Op. cit., para. 2496; Blass-Debrunner, Op. cit., para. 293, 2, 4.

¹²

A. T. Robertson (Op. cit., p. 727) also notes that Krüger (Grammatik) distinguishes ὅς and ὅστις by the former "Objective" and the latter "objective and generic" Kühner-Gerth (Op. cit., p. 399), Smyth (Op. cit., 2496), and Blass-Debrunner (Op. cit., para. 2496).

II Corinthians 8:10

τοῦτο γὰρ ὑμῖν συμφέρει,

οἵτινες...τὸ θέλειν προενήρξασθε ἀπὸ πέρυσι.

Admittedly, the foregoing relative clauses may possess a qualitative force, i.e. the relative in each may be interpreted to convey the sense of "those who belong to the group which..." or "seeing that they..." or "such as...". However, this is of little significance unless it can be demonstrated that no clause introduced by ὅς can be so interpreted.

Here as elsewhere, there is no distinction between the two relatives. Not only is there no way of explaining why such qualitative clauses would occur only with nominative relatives (as would be the case, if ὅστις alone had this meaning), but even more important, there are more qualitative clauses introduced by ὅς than by ὅστις.¹³ Examples of such clauses would include:

I Corinthians 12:23

ὃ δοκοῦμεν ἀτιμότερα εἶναι τοῦ σώματος,
τούτοις τιμὴν περισσοτέραν περιτίθεμεν.

¹³A few of the examples might include most of the following: Rom 4:24; 5:12 (6:10a, 10b?); 6:17, 21; 8:3, 29, 30a, 30b, 30c; I Cor 2:13; 10:11; 12:33; 16:3; II Cor 2:3; 4:4a; 10:2; 12:17; Gal 2:20; 3:1; 4:9; 5:17; Phil 3:18; 4:3a. This list is not intended to be exhaustive, nor does it claim the case for each example is equally strong. It is intended to illustrate some of the relatives, both singular and plural, which would fall within the range normally assigned to ὅστις by grammarians.

II Corinthians 4:4a

ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἐστὶν κεκαλυμμένον,

ἐν οἷς ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων

εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάζαι τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου....

Philippians 3:18

πολλοὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦσιν

οὕς πολλάκις ἔλεγον ὑμῖν, νῦν δὲ καὶ κλαίω
λέγω, τοὺς ἐχθροὺς τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ...

If more evidence were needed to show that the so-called qualitative force was not limited to ὅστις, one need only consider how frequently the qualitative ὅστις clauses (e.g. Romans 9:4; 16:4, 7; Galatians 2:4ff) are parallel to clauses introduced by ὅς.¹⁴

Equivalent or Parallel Relative Clauses, (sometimes in the same context and at other times in different contexts, introduced in one case by ὅς and in another by ὅστις) provide the strongest proof that ὅς and ὅστις are equivalents. Among such passages are:

Rom 16:4a	Πρῶσαν κτλ.	οἵτινες...ὑπέβησαν
Rom 16:4b	Πρῶσαν κτλ.	οἷς...εὐχαριστῶ...
Rom 16:7a	Ἀνδρόνικον κτλ.	οἵτινές εἰσιν...
Rom 16:7b	Ἀνδρόνικον κτλ.	οἱ...γέγοναν...
I Cor 6:5	οὔδεις σοφός ¹⁵	ὅς δυνήσεται...
Phl 2:20	οὔδενά ἰσόψυχον	ὅστις...μεριμνήσει

¹⁴On this point Robertson (op. cit., p. 726) and Turner (op. cit., p. 47), as opposed to Moule (op. cit., pp. 123-124), agree.

¹⁵Clauses in which the relative resumed the absolute pronoun οὔδεις were regularly introduced by a form of ὅστις in the earlier period. Cf. Kühner-Gerth, Op. cit., p. 403 (which discusses οὔδεις ὅστις at some length. Smyth,

Rom 4:16	Ἀβραάμ	ὅς ἐστιν πατήρ...
Gal 4:26	Ἱερουσαλήμ	ἥτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ...
Gal 2:4	ψευδαδέλφους	οἵτινες παρεισήλθον...
Gal 2:5	ψευδαδέλφους	οἷς...εἵξαμεν...
Gal 5:19	ἔργα ¹⁶	ἅτινά ἐστιν...
Gal 5:21	ἔργα	ἃ προλέγω...
Phl 4:3a	αὐταῖς ¹⁶	αἵτινες...συνήθλησαν...
Phl 4:3b	αὐταῖς	ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα κτλ.

In each of these cases above, it would appear that the two relatives are lexically and syntactically interchangeable.

In Summary the conclusion seems inescapable:

ὅστις is not distinct in meaning or syntax from ὅς, but has, in fact, replaced those nominative forms of the latter which are easily confused with the definite article. Considering (1) the complimentary distribution of both relatives, in connection with the use of both (2) to resume indefinite antecedents, (3) to indicate qualification or class, and (4) to introduce equivalent and/or parallel clauses, it is difficult to imagine what contravertible evidence might be brought against this conclusion.

If, as is claimed here, ὅστις has simply replaced some of the nominative forms of ὅς, what is to be made of

Op. cit., para. 2534, 2545, 2557; and Blass-Debrunner, Op. cit., para. 379, 431.

¹⁶ Whether the relatives in Gal 5:21 and Phl 4:3b resume the same substantive as the relative before them cannot be determined with certainty. Either could resume a series of substantives in the preceding relative clause. Paul's tendency in Rom 16 and elsewhere to use two or more relative clauses to praise an individual(s) and to use ὅστις and ὅς clauses in that order to refer to the same antecedent is the basis of this exegetical decision.

those cases in the declension in which equivalent forms of both appear (i.e. ὅς/ὅστις, ὅ/ὅτι, οἷ/οἵτινες)? The answer to this question has to do with a significant matter in Pauline style. Paul never begins two successive relative clauses with forms of ὅστις nor, in the case of parallel relative clauses, are the later clauses ever introduced by a form of ὅστις.¹⁷ Why ὅστις is used instead of ὅς in two cases (Gal 5:10; Phl 2:20) and ὅτι instead of ὅ in others (I Cor 16:2; II Cor 3:14) cannot be determined with certainty. It is evident, however, that as the nominative forms of ὅστις replaced certain forms of ὅς, the other nominative forms of each continued in declining usage.

Is ὅσοι An Alternative Nominative Plural Form of οἷ/οἵτινες? H. H. Cadbury suggests that this may be true in Luke - Acts.¹⁸

Although the evidence in the Homologoumena is not unambiguous on this question,¹⁹ nonetheless it seems quite

¹⁷ Rom 16:4a, 4b, 7b; Gal 2:4, 5; 5:19, 21; Phl 4:3a, 3b.

¹⁸

H. J. Cadbury made a less thorough survey of the use of ὅσοι in Luke-Acts than had been his treatment of ὅς/ὅστις. Nonetheless, he founded basically the same accidence as we find in Paul. He suggests that ὅσοι is equivalent to οἷ/οἵτινες or that it has replaced πάντες ὅι/οἵτινες/ὅσοι. Op. cit. pp. 156-157.

¹⁹ First, ὅσοι in Paul is limited to the nominative plural ὅσοι, ὅσαι and by analogy ὅσα - cf. ἐφ' ὅσων in n. 21 below), precisely the forms in which the simple relative and the definite article are distinguished only in accent. Second, ὅσοι, -αι, -α is never used with a plural substantive or with the correlatives τοσοῦτοι, -αὶ, -α

evident that Cadbury's suggestion is not valid in these epistles. The striking stylistic differences between the use ὅσοι, -αι, -α and those of οὔτινες, αἵτινες, ἕτινα indicates that the former are not alternative nominative plural forms of ὅς/ὅστις.²⁰ Rather, (1) the limitation of this relative to plural forms,²¹ (2) its exclusive employment

relationship that would make clear the quantitative force of the relative. Rather, the same demonstrative, οὗτος, is used to resume all three relatives:

Third, many parallel and/or equivalent passages exist, making it difficult to argue for any distinction in meaning between ὅσος and ὅς/ὅστις

E.g.

Rom 3:19 ὅσα ὁ νόμος λέγει τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλεῖ,...

Gal 5:21 ἃ προλέγω ὑμῖν κτλ.

Rom 6:3 ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν,

Rom 6:2 οὔτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ,

Rom 2:12 ὅσοι...ἀνόμως ἥμαρτον,...ὅσοι ἐν νόμῳ ἥμαρτον.

Gal 5:4 οὔτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε

Phl 4:8 ὅσα ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ κτλ., ταῦτα λογίζεσθε.

Phl 4:9 ἃ καὶ ἐμάθετε κτλ., ταῦτα πράσσετε.

²⁰First there are important stylistic differences in the use of clauses introduced by ὅς/ὅστις and those introduced by ὅσοι, -αι, -α. The former may refer to either definite or indefinite antecedents; the latter only to indefinite. The former may precede or follow the head clause; the latter always precede. The former may be either adjectival or substantival; the latter are always substantival. The former occasionally repeat the verb or a significant phrase from the head clause; the latter frequently manifest such repetition.

²¹The ἐφ' ὅσον clauses of Rom 7:11; 11:13; I Cor 7:39; Gal 4:1 have been excluded from consideration because the relative here has become a stereotyped adverbial connective. As such this form does not reflect on the question being discussed.

to introduce indefinite relative clauses, and (3) its regular use in sentences which are causally related to the preceding context²² in combination indicate that in the Homologoumena ὅσοι, -αι, -α are the equivalent of the otherwise absent πάντες οἱ/οὔτινες/ὅσοι.²³

To return to the original question: How are the three relatives related to each other? In the Homologoumena ὅς/ὅστις are one relative in which several of the nominative forms of ὅς have been replaced by equivalent forms of ὅστις with the single exception that Paul, as a matter of style, does not begin the second or third of successive relative clauses with a form of ὅστις. "ὅσοι", which only occurs in

²²The frequent use of ὅσοι clauses as substantives in constructions which are causally related to the context is the most decisive argument against identifying ὅσοι with ὅς/ὅστις. In six different ὅσοι clauses (Rom 2:12; 8:14; 15:4; II Cor 1:20; Gal 3:10; 3:27. Again the ὅς/ὅστις clauses have been excluded from consideration.) the relative is immediately followed by the causal particle, γάρ; in each case the particle does not go with the relative but with the head clause. Although the particle is not present the same kind of causal argument is made in Romans 3:19-20; 6:2-3; and probably also in Galatians 6:12. In each case Paul appears to be giving a generalizing or universal rule to establish either a preceding or succeeding statement. This generalizing force is also indicated for Philippians 4:8 where six ὅσα clauses are made parallel to εἰ τις ἀρετὴ καὶ εἰ τις ἐπαίτιος. Also the fact that ὅσοι, in contrast to ὅς/ὅστις, is found only in the plural may strengthen the argument that ὅσοι has a generalizing or universal force.

²³In the Homologoumena πᾶς is used with the relative only twice (Rom 14:23 and I Cor 6:18, both singular). Strangely, the idiom πᾶς ὅς/ὅστις/ὅσοι is common in all the Gospels and Acts, but is found elsewhere in the New Testament only in Col 3:17 and in these two passages.

stereotyped temporal ἐφ' ὅσον formulations and in the nominative plural, is distinct from ὅς/ὅστις; in the latter cases, i.e. the nominative plurals, it is the equivalent of the missing πάντες οἱ/οἵτινες/ὅσοι idioms.

2. Particles Used With The Relatives

The second question with which we began was:

What particles are used with the relatives (i.e. affect the meaning of the relative) and under what conditions? It has long been recognized that the use of particles varies considerably from author to author. As will be seen when the styles of the Antilegomena are compared to that of the Homologoumena, this is an issue of some consequence to the question of the authenticity of certain Antilegomena.

Paul uses eleven different modal and/or connective particles in close conjunction with the relative (καί, ἐάν, ἄν, μέν, δέ, γάρ, οὐ, γε, ἥ, οὐκ, οὐδέ). Not all of these, of course, affect the meaning of the relative, but it has already been demonstrated that some of them do (e.g. ἐάν and ἄν,²⁴ μέν and δέ²⁵). In most cases the Pauline usage is distinctive.

Καί is the most common particle in the relative

²⁴ ἐάν/ἄν Ch. II, pp. 135-137.

²⁵ μέν/δέ Ch. I, pp. 43-47.

clauses,²⁶ occurring seven times before ὅς²⁷ and twenty-three times immediately after the relative (e.g. ὁς καί...)²⁸ Although in other texts καὶ ὅς... may be a single constituent,²⁹ in each of the Pauline examples the force of καί before ὅς is simply conjunctive, i.e. it either joins a series of relative clauses (Rom 9:5) or a series of sentences in a compound construction (Rom 8:30b; I Cor 11:21a; 12:28).

Many scholars have noted that καί following the relative often gives the relative clause a semi-independent status vis-a-vis the head clause.³⁰ W. Bauer asserts that

²⁶ Καί occurs ninety times in the ὅς/ὅστις clauses of the Homologoumena. In all except the twenty-seven under consideration above, including I Cor 4:5 and Phil 4:10, it is simply a coordinating or correlative conjunction connecting compound constructions. Cf. eg.

²⁷ Rom 8:30b; 9:5; I Cor 11:21; 12:28. (Καὶ ὅσοις is also common: Rom 2:12; I Cor 15:48; Gal 5:16).

²⁸ Rom 5:2; 8:34; 9:24; 16:7; I Cor 1:8; 2:13; 4:5; 11:23; 15:1, 1, 3; II Cor 1:6; 3:6; Gal 2:10; Phil 2:5; 3:12, 20; 4:9, 10; I Th 1:5; 2:13; 5:24.

²⁹ Jannaris says that when the relative follows καί immediately it is like a demonstrative or personal pronoun. A. N. Jannaris, *An Historical Greek Grammar* (London, 1897) para. 605 and 1137. Cf. also Kühner-Gerth, *Op. cit.*, pp. 434-435; Smyth, *Op. cit.*, para. 2491, 2555; J. H. Foulton, *Op. cit.*, pp. 724 (in a reference to Hort's commentary on I Peter).

³⁰ Bauer says καί used with a relative clause often gives greater independence to the following relative clause; Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago, 1957), p. 394. Jannaris (*Op. cit.*, para. 1718) agrees relative is conceived as demonstrative and the clause becomes coordinate with antecedent.

this is the case in the Homologoumena, especially in I Corinthians 11:23a (ὁ καὶ παρέδωκε ὑμῖν) and Galatians 2:10 (ὁ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι).³¹ In such a case the particle would be part of the relative.

A clause by clause examination of the twenty-two clauses in the Homologoumena in which καὶ follows the relative immediately shows, however, (1) that in no case is καὶ a suffix or a part of the relative giving the clause semi-independent status,³² but (2) that in every case the force of καὶ is adjunctive (i.e. = also) and (3) that in every case it goes with and emphasizes the constituent which immediately follows the particle.³³ Consequently, although καὶ is found immediately after the relative in every Homologoumenon, except Philemon, in no case in the Homologoumena is καὶ a part of the relative.

³¹Bauer, *Op. cit.*, p. 394.

³²Bauer, (*loc. cit.*) cites I Cor 11:23 and Gal 2:10 as evidence that καὶ following the relative gives the relative clause greater independence vis-a-vis the head construction. On what basis such a claim is made for the former is not clear to me. Cf. the same construction in I Cor 15:1 & 3.

Gal 2:10 presents special difficulties because the construction is both problematic and pleonastic. However, there is no reason for failing to assume that in this case is also additive.

³³Cf. Chapter III, pp.230-235 on emphasis in Pauline relative clauses.

Typical illustrations the adjunctive use of καὶ to emphasize the new element in a clause may be seen, among others, in Rom 5:2a where the relative clause is parallel to the head clause and καὶ precedes τὴν προσαγωγὴν, the new item, or Rom 16:7 in which πρὸς ἑμοῦ the crucial addition, or Phl 2:5 in which καὶ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in the relative clause replaces ἐν ὑμῖν in the head construction.

οὐ is second most frequent particle in the relative clauses of the Homologoumena and is placed immediately after the relative in four epistles.³⁴ If it had been the case that the choice of the negative indicated that a particular relative clause is indefinite as is often claimed,³⁵ then it might be argued that the negative particle had affected the meaning of the relative. Since this was not the case³⁶ and since the negative always precedes the verb immediately, even when both negative and verb are later in the relative clause,³⁷ it seems evident that the negative particle is not a part of the relative but a part of the construction which immediately follows that particle.³⁸

³⁴It is the eighteen relative clauses in which the negative follows the relative immediately that are the concern here (Rom 7:16, 19, 20; 8:25; 10:14a, 14b, 23b; 15:18; 16:4; I Cor 4:7; 10:13; 15:9, 15; II Cor 5:4; 11:4a, 4b, 4c; Gal 1:7).

³⁵Goodwin asserts that μή is used with indefinite relative clauses and οὐ with definite. W. W. Goodwin, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb (Boston, 1889*) and W. W. Goodwin and B. Gulick, Greek Grammar (Boston, 1930) para. 1440a, 1454, 1457-1461. Also Kühner-Gerth, Op. cit., pp. 421-422; Smyth, Op. cit., para. 2497, al.

³⁶Six of the indefinite relative clauses were introduced by ὅς οὐ (Rom 7:16, 19b, 20; II Cor 11:4a, 4b, 4c). The remaining twelve introduce definite relative clauses (e.g. I Cor 10:13 πιστὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς, ὅς οὐκ ἔξει ὑμᾶς πειρασθῆναι ὑπὲρ ὃ δύνασθε ἀλλὰ ποιήσει... τὴν ἐκβασιν... . There are no examples of ὅς μή in the Homologoumena.

³⁷In Rom 8:32; 16:4; I Cor 1:13 and Phl 2:6 the negative is a correlative of ἀλλά. In 7:15-16 it negates a substantival relative clause.

³⁸Thus, it functions like the α-privative. This assumption finds additional confirmation in the position of the negative before the relative clauses in Rom 7:15b, 19b.

$\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ occurs ten times in the relative clauses of the Homologoumena; in each case it is followed by another construction containing $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and in each, except Romans 2:6 and II Corinthians 10:1, the particle immediately follows the relative. As we saw in Chapter I, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ in each of the clauses except Romans 11:13 ($\acute{\epsilon}\varphi' \theta\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu...$) the particle is a part of the relative in the sense it affects the meaning of the relative (i.e. relative introduces an antithetical clause which is usually independent).³⁹

$\Delta\acute{\epsilon}$ occurs in the relative clauses of the Homologoumena twenty-two times, fourteen immediately following the relative. In four of the cases Paul uses $\delta\varsigma \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ as a single constituent (Rom 9:21b; 14:5b; I Cor 11:21b; II Cor 2:16b)⁴⁰, all of them antithetical to a preceding $\delta\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu...$ clause. It should be noted that the idioms $\delta\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ and $\delta\varsigma \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ are found in three of the Homologoumena.

$\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ or $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ is found in nine relative clauses, always immediately after the relative.⁴¹ That these two

³⁹Chapter I, pp. 43-47. The exx. of $\delta\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ are Rom 9:21; 14:2, 5; I Cor 11:21; 12:8, 28; II Cor 2:16.

⁴⁰In all the remaining eighteen, except perhaps an ascensive force in Phl 2:8, the particle is used as a contrasting coordinating conjunction. In the ten in which the particle is always post-positive, but usually stands as close as possible to be beginning of the connected clause: Rom 6:10b; 8:30a, 30c; 9:18b; I Cor 7:37; II Cor 2:10; 11:12, 21; Gal 2:10.

⁴¹Rom 16:2 ($\tilde{\omega} \acute{\alpha}\nu$); I Cor 6:18 ($\delta \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$); 11:27 ($\delta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu$); 16:2 ($\delta \tau\iota \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$); 3 ($\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$); II Cor 11:21 ($\tilde{\omega} \acute{\alpha}\nu$); Gal 5:10 ($\theta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$); 5:17 ($\acute{\alpha} \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$); 6:7 ($\delta \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$).

particles are meaningful suffixes of the relative, i.e. they indicate an indefinite antecedent, became clear earlier in this chapter (II-134-139). It should be noted that these nine examples are scattered among four of the Homologoumena.

Γε, the only other particle used with the relative in the Homologoumena, is found in Romans 8:32 (ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατε,...). Here as elsewhere this particle intensifies the relative and gives it a causal force.⁴²

Four other particles follow the relative immediately, but none of them become suffixes to the relative. Γάρ occurs in that position in introductory relative clauses because it is a post-positive connective.⁴³ "H,⁴⁴ οὖν,⁴⁵ and οὐδέ,⁴⁶ which are occasionally found immediately

⁴²Bauer, *Op. cit.*, p. 152.

⁴³The postpositive causal connective γάρ follows the relative immediately thirteen times: δ γάρ: Rom 2:1; 6:10a; 7:15a, 15b; 8:24; I Cor 12:8; Gal 6:7. "ὅς γάρ: Rom 2:12; 8:14; 15:4; II Cor 1:20; Gal 3:10, 27. It was observed earlier that the γάρ in the ὅς clauses actually connects the head construction in a causal manner to the context. The fact that all of the relative clauses containing γάρ (except I Cor 12:8) are substantival and precede the head constructions would indicate that the same was true for them. In the exception, I Corinthians 12:8, the relative clause containing the particle is actually the first of ten exegetical clauses connected by the γάρ to the preceding sentence. Therefore, γάρ is never a part of the relative and does not affect its meaning.

⁴⁴"H in ἡ ἄ βουλευομαι (II Cor 1:17) is simply a disjunctive joining two rhetorical questions.

⁴⁵οὖν in ἐφ' ὅσον μὲν οὖν... (Rom 11:13) is an inferential particle which relates the head construction to its context; it happens to follow ἐφ' ὅσον μὲν because the relative clause introduces the head clause.

⁴⁶Paul uses οὐδέ at the beginning of any clause in

adjacent to the relative, are found in that position because of the nature of the particles themselves. They are not part of the relative and do not affect its meaning.

In Summary several conclusions emerge which are important for the discussion of the style of the Homologoumena:

(1) Paul uses five particles with the relative which affect its meaning: these become, in effect, relative suffixes.

All other particles which are immediately adjacent to the relative are there for other reasons. (2) ὅτι and ὅτι , when the latter is preceded by an equivalent form with μήν , indicate that relative has a demonstrative function introducing

alternatives. (3) ἔάν and ἄν always follow the relative immediately and indicate that it resumes an indefinite

antecedent. (4) τε , which occurs only once, intensifies the preceding relative and indicates that the relative clause

stands in a causal relationship to the head clause. (5) καί and οὐ , when they follow the relative immediately, are not part of the relative. That is, they do not indicate that the relative clause in semi-independent or indefinite

respectively. Rather both particles are part of the constituent which follows the particle. (6) No other

which it appears. The examples of this initial can be divided into two types: (1) οὐ(κ)...οὐδέ... as correlative conjunctions (E.g. Rom 2:28; Gal 1:12; Phl 2:16) and (2) negating and emphasizing the construction which follows it. The second circumstance is the case with $\text{ἥτις οὐδέ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν}$ (I Cor 5:1) and $\text{οἷς οὐδέ πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν κτλ.}$ (Gal 2:5). Therefore, οὐδέ is not a part of the relative.

particles are used as part of the relative.⁴⁷ As will be shown below,⁴⁸ this picture is quite different from that found in the Antilegomena.

3. The Form of the Relative

In a word-level analysis the third question concerning an author's style has to do with the distribution of the various forms of the relative and the variations in determining those forms, i.e. Constructio ad Sensum, attraction and inverse attraction. To those matters we now turn.

Table VI on the following page shows the distribution of the various forms of ὅς/ὅστις throughout the Pauline Corpus. This table illustrates a consistency and homogeneity in the style of the Homologoumena. For example, αἵτινα is the only form found as many as three times in the Homologoumena which is not found in at least three epistles.⁴⁹

⁴⁷Several observations have come to light in this analysis which will be useful in Chapter III: (1) Particles, unless they join coordinate compounds, come immediately after the relative in the Pauline clauses. (2) When a particle intensifies, and thus emphasizes, the constituent which follows (e.g. ascensive negative οὐδέ, adjunctive or ascensive καί, negative οὐ), that constituent with the particle is often moved to an early position in the relative clause.

⁴⁸Cf. pp. 171-195.

⁴⁹Gal 4:24; 5:19; Phl 3:7. All the forms of the relative which occur as many as four times in the Homologoumena are found in at least three epistles. The only forms found in less than three epistles are ὅστις (Gal 5:10; Phl 2:20), ὅ τε (I Cor 16:2; II Cor 3:14), ἡς (II Cor 1:4; 10:8), οὗ (Rom 16:7), and αἵτινες (Phl 4:3). αἵτινα (Gal 4:24; 5:19; Phl 3:7).

Neuter forms are common throughout the Homologoumena, especially in the dative and accusative singulars.⁵⁰ All examples of the neuter dative singular, except Galatians 3:19 (τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπὶγγεῖται), are introduced by a preposition. The relative absence of the feminine forms was noted above.⁵¹

Romans 16:5, a typical Pauline construction, will be useful in discussing both the normal form of the relative and the variations from that norm:

ἀσπάσασθε Ἐπαίνετον τὸν ἀγαπητὸν μου,

ὅς ἐστιν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας εἰς Χριστόν.

Observe that the relative resumes the substantive and is therefore a masculine singular. Its substantival function in its own clause is that of subject and, consequently, the relative takes the form of the nominative. Regularly in Paul, as in Greek generally, the form of the relative is determined by the dual functions of the relative; it agrees with the antecedent which it resumes in gender and number and its case is in concord with its substantival function in its

⁵⁰Galatians is the only Homologoumenon lacking a neuter accusative singular.

⁵¹Cf. II, pp. 132-134. The only examples of the genitive singular are found in II Corinthians 1:4 and 10:8 and the only nominative plural is found in Philipians 4:3. The other feminine forms are well distributed throughout the Homologoumena.

Neuter forms are very common throughout the accepted letters, especially in the dative and accusative singular. All the examples of the neuter dative singular, except Galatians 3:19 (τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπὶγγεῖται), are introduced by a preposition.

own clause.⁵² The examples Constructio ad Sensum, attraction and inverse attraction discussed below are the only significant departures from this general rule.⁵³

Constructio ad Sensum denominates the circumstance in which the relative agrees with the sense of the antecedent, either its actual number or actual gender, rather than the syntax of the antecedent. In such clauses the relative does receive the case of its substantival function in its own

⁵²If the antecedent of the relative is the preceding clause(s) the gender and number of the relative varies: The neuter singular δ in Gal 2:10 resumes the preceding $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \pi\iota\omega\chi\acute{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\ \mu\eta\eta\mu\omicron\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$. Perhaps δ in I Cor 11:23a and I Cor 15:3 resumes, in each case, the extended $\delta\tau\iota$ clause which follows. "Αττῖα in Gal 4:24a resumes a series of sentence constructions introduced by $\delta\tau\iota$; that several sentences serve as the antecedent probably explains the neuter plural. Phl 1:28 has $\acute{\eta}\tau\iota\varsigma$ resuming a long $\delta\tau\iota$ clause; the feminine nominative singular is probably explained by the fact that the relative clause is an equative with a feminine singular identifier, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\iota\varsigma$. Cf. Chapter I, p. 37.

⁵³Phl 2:5-6 are not exceptions as such but, among the Pauline relative clauses, these are rather unusual:

τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν
 δ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,
 δ ς...ἡγήσατο κτλ.

Only in Rom 2:15 and Phl 2:5 does the demonstrative precede the relative clause which it resumes. Also there is no agreement among scholars as to what the understood verb in the first relative clause should be.

οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσιν νόμος·

οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου... .

That the relative clause in verses is simply a transition between the exhortation and a confessional formula introduced by δ ς seems, to me to be the case. In Paul φρονέω usually takes a neuter accusative undergoer placed before the verb.

clause. Although the usage is not consistent⁵⁴ or frequent and its use or non-use follows no traceable patterns, the limited examples are spread throughout the Homologoumena.

The examples of Constructio ad Sensum in the Homologoumena classify themselves logically into three groups. (1) Some, of which Philipp'ans 3:20 is an example, agree with the actual number, rather than the syntactical number, of the antecedent.

ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει,

ἐξ οὗ καὶ σωτῆρα ἀπεκδεχόμεθα κτλ.⁵⁵

(2) In other cases the relative agrees with the actual gender, rather than the syntactical gender, of the antecedent.

Philemon 10 provides an example of this type:

παρακαλῶ σε περὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ τέκνου,

ὃν ἐγέννησα ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς, Ὀνήσιμον.⁵⁶

The other examples of this type, Romans 9:24 and Galatians 4:19a, as well as Philemon 10, may not be examples of Constructio ad Sensum, because all three passages contain

⁵⁴ Among the possible exceptions to Type 1 is Rom 11:2: τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν προέγνω. An exception to Type 2 is Rom 9:23: ἐπὶ σκεῦη ἐλέους...οὓς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν. I Cor 1:30-31; 4:17; Τιμόθεον, ὃς ἐστὶν μου τέκνον κτλ. are exceptions to Type 3.

⁵⁵ I Cor 3:17; Phl 2:15; 3:20 are the only examples of this type in the Homologoumena.

⁵⁶ The other examples of this type, Romans 9:24 and Galatians 4:19a, as well as Philemon 10, may not be examples of Constructio ad Sensum, because all three passages contain either appositives or complements in the same gender as the relative.

either appositives or complements in the same gender as the relative. (3) When the relative clause is an equative clause, the relative may take the gender or number of the identifier, as in Galatians 3:16:

οὐ λέγει...ἀλλ'...καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου,
ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός.⁵⁷

The Attraction of the Relative, occurs in the Homologoumena in either of two situations: (1) If the relative clause is used substantivally as a constituent and is governed by a functional connective or preposition, as in Romans 14:22, the relative is always attracted to case governed by the preposition.

μακάριος ὁ μὴ κρίνων ἑαυτὸν
ἐν ᾧ δοκίμαζει.⁵⁸

(2) Attraction also occurs when all four of the following conditions apply: (a) the head has either a genitive or dative inflection, (b) the expected form of the relative is either genitive, dative or accusative, but not the same case as the head, (c) there is no other parallel attributival construction, and (d) the relative functions in

⁵⁷I Cor 3:17; Gal 3:16; Phl 1:28 are the only examples of this type in the Homologoumena.

⁵⁸In Rom 14:22 an accusative undergoer with the predicate would be expected. Rom 4:17 has a genitive instead of the expected dative and Rom 16:2 has a dative where one would expect either the genitive or the accusative. These last two examples have the relative clause before the antecedent and are, therefore, often considered as examples of the incorporation of the antecedent within the relative clause.

its clause as an undergoer with a transitive or di-transitive verb. II Corinthians 10:2 provides an example of attraction that meets all four conditions:

δέομαι δὲ τὸ...θαρρῆσαι τῇ πεποιθήσει

ἢ λογίζομαι τολμῆσαι κτλ.⁵⁹

Philemon 10, cited above,⁶⁰ is one of several Pauline relative clauses, in which attraction does not occur because the antecedent is qualified by more than one adjectival construction.

Inverse Attraction in the Homologoumena is largely limited to Romans.⁶¹ The one example outside of that epistle is II Corinthians 10:13:

ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος

οὗ ἐμέρισεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς μέτρον, ...

A careful examination of the six examples of inverse attraction yields several observations which are pertinent to a discussion of Paul's style: (1) The antecedent is always incorporated in the relative clause. (2) Except in the stereotyped adverbial connective in Romans 2:16 (ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ...), Paul places the incorporated antecedent at the

⁵⁹The infinitive would normally take an accusative undergoer. Other examples include: Rom 15:18; I Cor 6:19; II Cor 1:4, 6; 7:7; 10:8, 13; 12:17, 21; I Th 3:9.

⁶⁰P. II-155. E.g. Rom 3:25; 6:16a, 16a; 10:14; I Cor 12:23; Phl 4:3. The only apparent exception is Rom 4:5 in which the relative clause has been shaped by Gen 15:6.

⁶¹Rom 2:16; 4:17; 6:17; 9:21a; 16:2; II Cor 10:13.

end of the relative clause.⁶² (3) The antecedent always agrees in case with the relative.⁶³

In Summary, we may conclude that the Homologoumena present a homogeneous picture with regard to the distribution of the forms of ὅς/ὅστις. Almost all of the forms of the relatives are distributed widely throughout these epistles.⁶⁴ In most cases the form of the relative is determined by its dual function, i.e. to resume an antecedent and to act as a substantive in its own clause. Where this is not the case, the variation is due to the influence of the antecedent. Even the variations from the regular forms, infrequent though they be, are widely spread in the Homologoumena.

⁶²Thus, the relative clause is in the pre-position of the adjective. The repetition of the antecedent in II Corinthians 10:13 and the fact that all the antecedents agree in case with the relative both indicate that these six examples are actual cases of incorporation and not simply the prepositing of the adjectival relative clause.

⁶³This means that in Romans 6:17 and II Corinthians 10:13, the antecedent is attracted to the case of the relative, in Romans 2:16 both would be in the same case, and in Romans 4:17 and 16:2 the antecedent has the same case as the relative governed by the preposition. The relative in Romans 9:21a is nominative and the antecedent would normally be in the accusative; since there is no difference between the nominative and accusative forms of the neuter, we cannot tell whether attraction has occurred or not. II Corinthians 10:13 is a special case; the relative has apparently been attracted to the genitive τοῦ κενόνοϋς but the repetition of μέτρον in the genitive makes it clear that this substantive is the antecedent.

⁶⁴Very few (6) are found in less than three epistles and only three are found in a single epistle. A wide variety of forms is found in each epistle except I Thessalonians (three forms in four relative clauses) and Philemon (where all are accusative.)

4. The Functions of the Relatives Three of the introductory questions deal with the functions of the relative in its own clause: (4) What are the distribution for the various ... relative functions? (5) When do relatives introduce independent sentences and what relatives are so used? (6) Under what conditions do relatives function as adverbial connectives? This study of the style of the Homologoumena turns now to those questions.

The Substantival Function of the relative within its own clause has been alluded to earlier in this chapter. This is the role of the relative as a substantive in its own clause.

Table VII on the following page summarizes the distribution of the various substantival functions of the relative throughout the corpus.⁶⁵ One has to be especially careful in using those statistics because the particular functions manifested depends so much on subject matter and verb choice. Nonetheless, a comparison which relates verb choice to style and which deals with contrasting idioms is both justified and useful.

Although each epistle has its own peculiarities, i.e. relative functions which are present, absent, or occur with greater frequency in that epistle,⁶⁶ the similarity of

⁶⁵ All the relatives of the Corpus have been classified and listed according to their substantival functions in Appendix IV.

⁶⁶ Among the peculiarities are the following:
Romans--The relative is used as an undergoer with an intransitive verb, i.e. cognate accusative or accusative of

TABLE VII
RELATIVE CONSTITUENT FUNCTIONS

	Actor	Subject	Identifier	Undergoer	Benefactor	Agent Genitive	Agent Dative	Possessive	Whole Genitive	Source	Location	Instrument	Cause	Purpose	Referent
Rom	16	9		37	7	3	1	3		1	2	1	2	1	
I Cor	9	7	2	26	5	4				1	4		1		
II Cor	7			23	1			2					2		1
Gal	1	5	1	14	4	1				1					
Phl	4	3		2				3			2		1	1	
I Th	2			2											
Phm				5											
II Th	2	1		5	1			1							
Col	1	11		10	1		3	2		1	1		2	2	
Eph	1	7		9	1		8	1		2	2	2			1
I Tm	4	1		11	1				2	1				2	
II Tm	1	5		8	1				2				1	1	
Tit	3			6											

the employment of the relative in the Homologoumena is

content, only in Romans 6:10 (bis)

ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν
τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ.
ὁ δὲ ζῇ
ζῇ τῷ θεῷ.

and Galatians 2:20; in each case the relative clause is substantival Type I serving the same function.

ὁ δὲ νῦν ζῷ ἐν σαρκί
ἐν πιστεὶ ζῷ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.

The use of ἐν ᾧ as a causal connective is limited to Romans 2:1 and 8:3;

ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίνεις τὸν ἕτερον
σεαυτὸν κατακρίνεις.

τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου
ἐν ᾧ ἡσθένη διὰ τῆς σαρκός,
ὁ θεός...κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί....
The only example of ἐν ᾧ instrumental in the Homologoumena is found in Romans 7:6:

νυνὶ δὲ κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου,
ἀποθάνοντες
ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα,....

However, both 7:6 and 8:15 may be examples of an agency relative:

ἀλλὰ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας
ἐν ᾧ κρᾶζομεν· ἄββὰ ὁ πατήρ.

I Corinthians--The only relatives employed as identifier constituents are found in I Corinthians 15:10 (χάριτι δὲ θεοῦ εἰμι ὃ εἰμι) and Galatians 5:10:

ὁ δὲ παράσγων ὑμᾶς βαστάσει τὸ κρίμα,
ὅστις ἐὰν ᾖ.

In all nine examples of the relative used as an actor the form is ὅς. The only datives of location without prepositional connectives are found in I Corinthians 7:20 (ἐν τῇ κλήσει ἣ ἐκλήθη) & 11:23(νυκτὶ ᾗ).The relative is not used to show possession in this epistle.

II Corinthians makes almost no use of the relative as subject of either an expressed or unexpressed copula. The only exception is 1:20: ὅσαι γὰρ ἐπαγγελίαι θεοῦ. The only possible example of the relative as benefactee in this epistle is the debatable example in 1:10b (τῷ θεῷ...ἐς ὃν ἠλπικαμεν) but this designation is most unlikely. The proportion of relatives (60%) used as undergoers is higher than any epistle except Philemon. The only relative functioning as a referent in the Homologoumena is in II Corinthians 12:13:

τί γὰρ ἐστίν
ὁ ἡσώθητε ὑπὲρ τὰς λοιπὰς ἐκκλησίας,
εἰ μὴ (ἐστίν)
ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ οὐ κατενάρκησα ὑμῶν;

noteworthy. Most of the substantival functions are found in three or more epistles, if as many as four cases of that function occur in those epistles. Also the ratio of the number of relatives in a particular epistle manifesting a particular function to the total number of relatives in that epistle is rather consistent. The striking exception to this is Philemon where all five relatives are undergoers; in this case the variation is the result of the shortness of this epistle and its peculiarities as a letter of commending

Galatians--Some of the more rare relative functions in this epistle were noted in the discussion of Romans and I Corinthians above. In this epistle relatives function as actors and as non-nuclear constituents (especially prepositional connectives) less frequently than is usual in the Homologoumena. The temporal connective μέχρις οὗ is found only in Galatians 4:19. Philippians 4:8 is the most extensive use of the relative as subject of an unexpressed copula:

τὸ λοιπόν, ἀδελφοί,
 ὅσα ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ,
 ὅσα σεμνά,
 ὅσα δίκαια,
 ὅσα ἀγνά,
 ὅσα προσφιλῆ,
 ὅσα εὐφημα,
 εἴ τις ἀρετὴ
 καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος,
 ταῦτα λογίζεσθε.

The relative functions as an undergoer fewer times in this epistle than one would normally expect.

Philemon's five relatives all are employed as undergoers with transitive active verbs. The intensive use of relative clauses, as well as appositives, seems to be characteristic of Paul's sentence of commendation (e.g. Rom 16; I Cor 4:17; II Cor 8:18-23; Phl 2:19-23, 25-30; I Th 3:2ff - Robert Funk, "The Apostolic Parousia: Form and Significance," Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 249-268).

Onesimus to Philemon.⁶⁷

Several phenomena should be noted because they are common in various Homologoumena, but relatively lacking in various Antilegomena. The masculine nominative is employed frequently (35x) as the actor, either with transitive,⁶⁸ di-transitive,⁶⁹ or intransitive verbs.⁷⁰ This contrasts with the twenty times that the nominative fills a subject slot with a copula verb.⁷¹ The figures for the ὅσος clauses in the Homologoumena are comparable. Five of the subject nominatives in the ὅς/ὅστις clauses have no expressed copula, as do seven of the ὅσος clauses.⁷²

Far more relative function as undergoers in the Homologoumena than as any other constituent type. Four each of the ὅς/ὅστις and the ὅσος relatives serve as undergoer nominatives with transitive passive verbs.⁷³ One

⁶⁷Cf. n. 66 above.

⁶⁸E.g. Rom 2:6 ὃς ἀποδώσει...; Rom 1:24 οἵτινες μετήλλαξαν...; I Cor 4:5; II Cor 8:10.

⁶⁹E.g. I Cor 1:8 ὃς καὶ βεβαιώσει ὑμᾶς... ἀνεγκλήτους...; Rom 2:15 οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ ἔργον... γραπτῶν...; II Cor 3:6; Phl 3:21.

⁷⁰E.g. I Th 2:13 ὃς καὶ ἐνεργεῖται...; Phl 4:3 αἵτινες... συνήθησαν...; Rom 2:23; I Cor 11:21a.

⁷¹E.g. Rom 1:25 ὃς ἐστὶν εὐλογητός...; Gal 4:24 ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα; I Cor 1:30; Phl 3:7.

⁷²E.g. Rom 14:23b πᾶν δὲ ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως; I Cor 5:1 ἡτις οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; Phl 3:15 ὅσοι οὐν τέλειοι.

⁷³E.g. Rom 4:25 ὃς παρεδόθη... ἠγέρθη...; I Cor 16:2 ὅτι ἐὰν εὐδοῶται; Gal 3:27 ὅσοι... ἐβαπτίσθητε.

of the relative undergoers is in the genitive (Rom 10:14b οὐδ' οὐκ ἤκουσαν) and five in the dative.⁷⁴ By far the largest number (93) are accusative undergoers with transitive active verbs,⁷⁵ although two are used with di-transitive verbs.⁷⁶

The Homologoumena utilize relatives as benefactees datives without preposition some thirteen times.⁷⁷ Agency is regularly shown (8x) by a genitival relative governed by διὰ.⁷⁸ Eight passive genitives are found.⁷⁹ Most of the relatives governed by ἐν are local⁸⁰ or causal.⁸¹

Relatives Introduce Independent Sentences in at least seven, and perhaps nine, cases in the Homologoumena. In these epistles only antithetical clauses introduced by

⁷⁴Gal 4:9 οἷς..δουλεῦσα, θέλετε; Rom 1:9; 4:17; 6:16b; 16:2.

⁷⁵E.g. Phm 12 ὃν ἀνέπεμψα...; Gal 1:8; I Th 1:10.

⁷⁶E.g. Rom 3:25 ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον...; II Cor 12:6 ὃ βλέπει με ἢ ἀκούει ἐξ ἐμοῦ.

⁷⁷E.g. Gal 2:5 οἷς...εἴξαμεν ...; Rom 4:6; I Cor 7:39.

⁷⁸E.g. I Cor 3:5 δι' ὧν ἐπιστεύσατε; Rom 5:2a; Gal 6:14.

⁷⁹Rom 2:29 οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος...ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ; II Cor 8:18; Phl 3:19a.

⁸⁰6x; e.g. Phl 2:15 ἐν οἷς φαίνεσθε; Rom 5:2b; I Cor 7:24.

⁸¹3x; e.g. Rom 14:21 ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀδελφός σου προσκρίπτει; II Cor 11:12b, 21.

ὅς μὲν or ὅς δέ function this way.⁸²

Relatives Function As Adverbial Connectives in
fourteen relative clauses of the Homologoumena. In these cases the relative no longer serves a substantival function in its own clause; neither does it resume a substantive antecedent in the head clause.⁸³

Although the same relative may in one sentence serve a substantival function and in another be an adverbial subordinating connective, there is seldom any problem in distinguishing the two, as the following examples will show:

Romans 6:21

τίνα οὖν καρπὸν εἴχετε τότε;

ἐφ' οἷς⁸⁴ νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε·

τὸ γὰρ τέλος ἐκείνων θάνατος.

⁸²Cf. the complete discussion of these clauses in I, pp. 43-47.

⁸³Sometimes an antecedent noun will occur in the relative clause as part of the relative phrase itself; See e.g. Rom 2:16 ἐν ἡ ἡμέρα...; Rom 7:1 ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον; Col 1:6 ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας; II Tim 1:6 δι' ἣν αἰτίαν. In these cases the substantive is not a true antecedent, but rather serves to denote the type of connective.

⁸⁴While no antecedent for ἐφ' οἷς appears in the head clause of Romans 6:21 (Note; the relative clause in a substantival clause of Type II), clearly a genitive plural with καρπὸν assumed; if there is any doubt about this fact, the presence of ἐκείνων in the succeeding causal clause clears it up. ἐφ' οἷς functions as a causal substantive in its own clause. On the other hand, in Romans 5:12 ἐφ' ᾧ cannot refer to θάνατος the only possible antecedent, and it does not fulfil any substantive function in its own clause.

Romans 5:12

διὰ τοῦτο

ὥσπερ δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία...εἰσῆλθεν...,
καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν,
ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον.

Every example of relatives used as adverbial
subordinating connectives is listed below:

ἐν ᾧ (Causal):	Rom 2:1; ⁸⁵ 8:3. ⁸⁶
ἐφ' ᾧ (Causal):	Rom 5:12; 1 Cor 5:5; Phl 3:12.
ἄχρι οὗ (Temporal):	Rom 11:25; 1 Cor 11:26; 15:25.
μέχρις οὗ (Temporal):	Gal 4:19b.

⁸⁵Bauer, (Op. cit., p. 261) regards this relative as local. An instrument connective is also possible. Nonetheless, Blass-Debrunner (para. 219, 2) and Turner (p. 253) seem to be correct in interpreting it causally, since the γάρ clause following the head clause is parallel and expegetical to the relative clause.

⁸⁶Sandy-Headlam, Karl Barth and Otto Kuss insist that ἐν ᾧ is a connective of specification. However, just how that is different in force in this context from a causal conjunction is not clear. Although ἐν ᾧ can be paraphrased 'in respect to the fact that' and, 'as a result', this passage must be regarded as ambiguous, nonetheless, the relative seems to tell why the law was impotent in dealing with sin. For that reason it has been classified as a causal connective by Barrett, Bauer (p. 261), Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, 5th ed. The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1905), p. 192. Karl Barth, The Epistle to the Romans, 6th ed. Tr. by Edwyn C. Hoskyns. (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), p. 282. Otto Kuss, Der Römerbrief (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1963), p. 491. C.K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Black's New Testament Commentaries. (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957 & 1962), p. 153-155.

ἐφ' ὅσον (χρόνον) (Temporal): Rom 7:1; 11:13;
I Cor 7:39; Gal 4:1.

ἐν ᾧ ἡμέρα (Temporal): Rom 2:16

All of the Pauline examples are either causal or temporal.⁸⁷

5. Summary Direct and generally unambiguous answers to the first six questions in the introduction have emerged from the analysis of the relatives in the Pauline Homologoumena.

(1) ὅστις has become the nominative form (at least in the feminine singular and in all the nominative plural forms) of ὅς, and ὅσοι, -αι, -α has replaced πάντες οἱ / οὔτινες / ὅσοι. (2) Μέν, δέ, ἐάν, ἄν and γέ are used with the

relative and affect its meaning, but in no case is καί or οὐ a part of the relative construction. (3) Both the

regular forms and the variation forms, i.e. Constructio ad Sensum, attraction and inverse attraction, are widely and proportionately distributed throughout the Homologoumena.

The latter are not frequent, but Constructio ad Sensum and inverse attraction do follow describable style patterns.

(4) The various substantival functions of the Pauline relatives are widely attested and proportionately distributed throughout the Homologoumena. (5) Only antithetical relative clauses introduced by ὅς μέν or ὅς δέ are ever independent in the Homologoumena. (6) All the relatives in the fourteen clauses in which the relative is simply an adverbial

⁸⁷It is interesting that the three groups of epistles in our corpus (i.e. Homologoumena, Ephesians-Colossians, and Pastorals) share no common relative connective.

connective introduce either temporal or causal clauses. Most of these idioms are also attested in more than one epistle.

In answering the first six questions as they relate to the Homologoumena, the seventh question has also been answered. The style patterns of the Homologoumena are employed with notable consistency throughout those epistles. Any linguistic phenomenon at a word-level which occurs as many as four times in these epistles.⁸⁸ Furthermore, such common phenomena as indefinite relative clauses, undergoer accusatives, neuter datives and relatives followed by are manifested proportionately in most of the seven epistles.

Having said this, it is now possible to answer the eighth question also. Several patterns have come to light which seem to be characteristic of the Pauline idioms, especially when the Homologoumena and Antilegomena are compared. (1) Paul makes heavy use of the indefinite relative clause (114/252). (2) Although ὅς/ὅστις is a single relative, only the first in parallel relative clauses is introduced by a form of ὅστις. (3) ὅσοις clauses is stylistically, as well as lexically, distinct from ὅς/ὅστις; ὅσοις clauses always precede the head clause, are always indefinite, and regularly introduce sentences which are causally related to their context. Also ὅσοις, except in

⁸⁸Inverse attraction is the single exception.

stereotyped adverbial connectives, is only used in the plural.

In addition, (4) the use of particles with the relative, while limited, is distinct; the failure to use καί with the relative, in the light of the frequency of καί in the relative clauses, is noteworthy. (5) Although Paul has a fondness for ἐν Χριστῷ formulations, these are never represented by ἐν ᾧ in the Homologoumena. Rather δι' οὗ is regularly used to refer to Jesus in an agency constituent. Most ᾧ-masculines referring to a divine name resume θεός and occur without prepositional connective.⁸⁹ (6) Neuter forms, especially the dative and accusative singulars, are quite common in most epistles; in every cases, but Galatians 3:19, the neuter dative singular is connected by a preposition. (7) In contrast almost none of the masculine dative singular and plural forms are governed by prepositions.⁹⁰ (8) Feminine forms are quite rare.

⁸⁹Of special interest, because of Paul's known fondness for ἐν Χριστῷ formulations, is the fact that none of the datives, with or without prepositions, refer to Ἰησοῦς Χριστός as antecedent. Only two resume θεός: Rom 1:9 μαρτυς γάρ μου ἐστὶν ὁ θεός, ᾧ λατρεύω...; and Gal 11:5 τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων ἀμήν. On the other hand, whenever Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is antecedent of a genitive, that genitive is regularly the agency constituent δι' οὗ. (The ambiguous κυρίου is the antecedent of οὗ ἤκουσαν in Rom 10-14b,) and δι' οὗ refers to Ἰησοῦς Χριστός at every point but one (Rom 1:5 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, δι' οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν...; Rom 5:2, 11; I Cor 8:6b and Gal 6:14 (?)). The one clear exception is I Cor 1:9 πιστὸς ὁ θεός δι' οὗ ἐκλήθητε εἰς...).

⁹⁰The exceptions are Rom 7:6 ἐν τῷ κατειχόμεθα (a debatable case), II Cor. 4:4 ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις... ἐν οἷς... ἐτύφλωσεν..., and Phil 2:15 γενεᾶς... ἐν οἷς φαίνεσθε.

Furthermore, (9) most relatives in the Homologoumena function as nuclear constituents. (10) Actor nominatives are much more common than subject nominatives. (11) Over 40% of the relatives in the Homologoumena function as undergoers in their own clause. (12) Benefactee datives without preposition are common. (13) Most of the relatives governed by *ἐν* are local or causal. (14) In none of the fourteen clauses or temporal connective, does the relative have a demonstrative force, or introduce an independent sentence.

B. THE RELATIVES OF THE ANTILEGOMENA

A word-level analysis shows the Antilegomena, both generally and individually, contrast with the style of the relative clauses of the Homologoumena (at the same level of analysis). The particularities of each stylistic contrast are not universal in the Antilegomena; in fact, one of the Antilegomena will usually resemble the style of the Homologoumena at each point of contrasting style. Nonetheless, the facts that (1) the supporting Antilegomena is a different one at each point in the discussion and (2) the contrasts with common Pauline patterns is so general, lends corroborative evidence to the allegation that none of the Antilegomena are authentically Paul's.

1. The Antilegomena Contrasts Generally

The Antilegomena, in general, contrast with the Homologoumena at several significant points of Paul's style:

- (1) Indefinite relative clauses are much less frequent.⁹¹
- (2) Throughout the Antilegomena, as in the Homologoumena, ὅς and ὅστις are always different forms of the same relative, at least in all the epistles presenting enough evidence to judge. However, when forms of both ὅς and ὅστις are used together, the Antilegomena do not follow the Pauline of ὅστις first and ὅς in all succeeding clauses.⁹² (3) The particles which are used with the relative in the Homologoumena (μέν, δέ, ἐάν, ἄν, γε) almost never occur with it in the Antilegomena.⁹³ On the other hand καί is used frequently with the relative in the Antilegomena and generally indicates that the relative clause is at least semi-independent.
- (4) Three types of Constructio ad Sensum are found in the Homologoumena, but only the third type, i.e. relative in the gender of the identifier in an equative clause is found in the Antilegomena.⁹⁴ (5) Only Ephesians follows the Pauline pattern in attraction. Also inverse attraction and the related incorporation of the antecedent is limited to

⁹¹About 44% of all the relatives in the Homologoumena are indefinite; the actual range is from 20% in Phm to 55% in Phl. II Th (7.5%) Col (9%) and Eph (2.77%) fall even below Phm.

⁹²Cf. Col 3:22-23; Tit 1:11-12; also II Tim 2:17-18.

⁹³Exceptions are ἐάν in Col 3:17, 23 and μέν/δέ in II Tim 2:20a, 20b.

⁹⁴The single exception is Col 2:19 (τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐξ οὗ...).

stereotyped adverbial connectives in the Antilegomena.⁹⁵

(6) With regard to the distribution of forms, feminine forms are much more frequent, all accusatives and $\tilde{\omega}$ -neuter are much less frequent, and $\tilde{\alpha}$ -nominative has held its own against $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\iota\upsilon\alpha$ -nominative in the Antilegomena. (7) Generally the Antilegomena contain fewer relatives functioning as actors, benefactees, undergoers, identifiers and locatives. The agency genitive with $\delta\iota\alpha$ is not found at all, but more relatives serve as purpose constituents. (8) As we saw in Chapter I,⁹⁶ the Homologoumena and the Antilegomena do not share any relative adverbial clause connections but, in fact, often contain contrasting idioms. (9) Although $\tilde{\omega}$ -masculine occasionally resumes $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ or equivalents in both Homologoumena and Antilegomena,⁹⁷ the $\delta\iota'\omicron\upsilon$ of agent to resume $\text{'}\text{I}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\text{X}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ regularly found in the Homologoumena is missing from the Antilegomena.

Furthermore, the Antilegomena contain many idioms which either contrast with equivalent idioms in the

⁹⁵The only examples are $\delta\omicron\text{' } \eta\varsigma \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma$ (Col 1:6, 9), $\delta\iota'\ \eta\nu \alpha\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ (II Tim 1:6a, 12a; Tit 1:13) and $\delta\nu \tau\rho\acute{o}\pi\omicron\nu$ (II Tim 3:8).

⁹⁶I, pp. 47-49, 52-53.

⁹⁷Only $\delta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ is resumed by a dative in the Homologoumena, and that only twice in stereotyped phrases (Rom 1:9; Gal 1:5). Similar stereotyped phrases using the dative of the relative are found in I Tim 6:16b; II Tim 1:3; 4:18. All of these contrast markedly with the frequent instrumental use of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tilde{\omega}$ in Colossians and Ephesians to resume a divine name, usually $\text{'}\text{I}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\text{X}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ (e.g. Col 1:14; 2:3; Eph 1:11, 13a, 13b; 2:21, 22; 3:12; 4:30).

Homologoumena or else are not found in the authentic epistles.

(1) In particular, attention should be called to the use of ἀνθ' ὧν and εἰς ὃ in II Thessalonians, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας and εἰς ὃ in Colossians, ὅν τρόπον and δι' ἧν αἰτίαν in II Timothy and the latter also in Titus, idioms which not only do not occur in the Homologoumena but which contrast to relative idioms there.⁹⁸ (2) The only ὅσοις clause in the Corpus which follows the head clause is in Colossians 2:1. (3) Ephesians has no indefinite relative clauses. (4) Several forms are peculiar to the Antilegomena: ἕως (I Th 2:15); αἵς (I Th 1:4; Eph 2:2); ἕ-nominative; ὧν-feminine (I Tim 1:6; 6:4). (5) Only Colossians and Ephesians utilize ἐν ᾧ-masculine as an agency constituent. (6) The relative used as the genitive of the whole is found only in I and II Timothy. (7) The relative serves as the undergoer for a subordinate participle only in I Timothy. (8) Only Titus 1:26 uses μή in an indefinite relative clause.

2. II Thessalonians

The thirteen relative clauses of I Thessalonian differ from the style of Homologoumena even more at a word-level, than they did at a phrase-level (Chapter I). Only one, or at the most two, of the clauses are indefinite, an unusually small proportion. The only clause which can with

⁹⁸For Pauline contrasting idioms, see the discussion under the particular Antilegomenon below.

any certainty, be identified as indefinite is

II Thessalonians 1:9:

οἰδόντος ἐκδίκησεν τοῖς μὴ εἰδόνιν θεὸν καὶ τοῖς
μὴ ὑπακούουσιν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ,
οἵτινες δικὴν τίσουσιν ὄλεθρον αἰώνιον...⁹⁹

Although the only indefinite clause in this epistle is also the only clause introduced by ὅστις and also all of the ὅς clauses are definite. There is not enough evidence to determine whether ὅς and ὅστις were distinguished by the author.

The only particle which follows the relative in II Thessalonians is καί. Its use in 1:5 (ὅπερ ἤς καὶ πᾶσχετε) is additive with the verb, much like II Corinthians 1:6. The situation is quite different in 1:11 (εἰς ὃ καὶ προσευχόμεθα πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν, ἵνα ὑμᾶς ἀξιώσῃ...ὁ θεός

⁹⁹II Thessalonians 1:9 is similar to the indefinite οἵτινες clauses in Romans 1:25, 32. In II Thessalonians the author seems to be equating "those who do not know God and who do not obey the gospel" with the specific group τοῖς θλίβουσιν ἡμᾶς (1:6). However, because of the nature of the material i.e. it asserts the final meeting out of judgment to the persecutors and the persecuted on the basis that at the revelation of the Lord all unbelievers will receive eternal condemnation, the οἵτινες clause in 1:9 is probably indefinite and generalizing.

The relative clause in 3:4 is probably definite:

ὃ παραγγέλλομεν
ποιεῖτε καὶ ποιήσετε.

Although it is substantival and is formed like many of the Pauline indefinite relative clauses, in II Thessalonians this clause is part of the author's concern for obedience to the tradition. The meaningful parallel is 2:15: κοσμεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε εἴτε διὰ λόγου εἴτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν and the antonym is 3:16: παραγγέλλομεν δὲ ἡμῖν...στέλλεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ πάντος ἀδελφοῦ ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντος καὶ μὴ κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἣν παραλάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν. The writer has in mind a definite set of instructions which he is confident that they will obey.

ἡμῶν καὶ πληρώσῃ πάσαν εὐδοκίαν...) and 2:14 (εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὑμᾶς διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἡμῶν, εἰς περιποίησιν δόξης τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. In both clauses εἰς ὃ has a demonstrative force, anticipating the purpose constructions which come at the end of each clause (ἵνα ὑμᾶς ἀξίωσῃ... καὶ πληρώσῃ... and εἰς περιποίησιν respectively). In each εἰς ὃ καὶ introduces an independent sentence.¹⁰⁰ This idiom is not only foreign to the Homologoumena, but it also contrasts to the equivalent εἰς τοῦτο constructions found there.¹⁰¹

Both Constructio ad Sensum and the attraction of the relative are found in II Thessalonians in the only sentences in which those variations could occur. The example of the former is II Thessalonians 3:17:

ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου,
ὃ ἐστὶν σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ.¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰For a full discussion and relevant bibliography on this point see B. Rigaux Saint Paul Les Epitres and Thessaloniens. Etudes Bibliques (Paris, 1956) pp. 637, 685-686.

¹⁰¹Rom 14:9; II Cor 2:9. Cf. also the comments on Chapter I, p. 55. The use of εἰς ὃ in II Th 1:11; 2:14 also contrasts with that in Col 1:29 in which εἰς ὃ, while introducing an independent clause, resumes the ἵνα clause in the preceding sentence.

¹⁰²This is an example of the third type, i.e. one in which the relative in an equative clause has been attracted to the gender of identifier (in this case also the actual gender of the antecedent). This sentence is not an exegetical ὃ ἐστὶν clause such as one finds in Colossians or Ephesians because it does not define ἀσπασμὸς with an appositive.

The attraction of the relative is found in II Thessalonians 1:4:

ὥστε...ἐγκαυχᾶσθε...ὕπὲρ τῆς ὑπομονῆς ὑμῶν καὶ
πίστεως ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς διωγμοῖς ὑμῶν καὶ θλίψεσιν

αἷς ἀνέχεσθε

ἔνδειγμα τῆς δικαίας κρίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ,...¹⁰³

In each of these cases it is difficult to determine whether they match the patterns of the Homologoumena.

Although this epistle has only thirteen relatives, the distribution of the relative forms differs from what one would expect in the Homologoumena. The feminine accusative plural αἷς is found in the entire corpus only in II Thessalonians 2:15, and αἷς is found only in 1:4 and Ephesians 2:2. The absence of any masculine plural forms is unusual but this trait, like the limited use of the relative with prepositions, is also found in I Thessalonians and Philemon.

'Αυθ' ὧν in 2:10 is used as a causal connective. This form is not found elsewhere in the corpus and it contrasts to the Pauline ἐν ᾧ (Rom 8:3) and ἐφ' ᾧ (Rom 5:12; II Cor 5:4; Phl 3:12).

3. Colossians

As was noted in Chapter I, the forty-three relative

¹⁰³ αἷς may be a case of the attraction of either genitive or accusative to the dative. If ἔνδειγμα is an appositive for διωγμοῖς and θλίψεσιν, then attraction here is contrary to the Pauline pattern. But, as Rigaux (*Op. cit.* pp. 619-20) has suggested, ἔνδειγμα may be apposition to ὑπομονῆς and πίστεως. In that case the attraction would fit normal Pauline style.

clauses of Colossians contain examples of Pauline style traits not found elsewhere in the Antilegomena. For example,

- (1) There are enough examples of both ὅς and ὅστις in Colossians for us to conclude that ὅς/ὅστις is one relative.¹⁰⁴
- (2) Colossians is the only one of the Antilegomena to have the usual Pauline ἔτινα-nominative (2:33) and the only epistle in the corpus to possess ὅ τι-accusative (3:17).¹⁰⁵
- (3) Colossians is the only epistle in the Antilegomena to use ἐάν with the relative, containing both ὃ ἐάν (3:17) and ὅ τι ἐάν (3:23).¹⁰⁶

Nonetheless, at almost every point the style of the relatives in Colossians contrasts with that exhibited by those in the Homologoumena. A striking instance of this is found in the fact that only four (2:1; 3:17, 23, 25) of the forty-three relatives of Colossians resume indefinite antecedents, a unusually small proportion. Moreover, the relative idioms in at least three of these four indefinite relative clauses varies from the usual Pauline style in one

¹⁰⁴The use of both definite and indefinite clauses (cf. n. 107 below) (1) refer to the same antecedents, (cf. 2:22-23 below) and (2) with ἐστίν in the exegetical ὃ ἐστίν clauses, as well as (3) the limitation of ὅστις to those nominative and accusative forms in which the simple relation contrasts with the definite adjective only in accent, argues conclusively that for this author also ὅς/ὅστις is one relative.

¹⁰⁵But for each of these, Col also contains the equivalent form of ὅς: ἔτινα-nominative (the only form found elsewhere in the Antilegomena, but never in the Homologoumena) and ὅ τι-accusative. Why both forms occur is not clear.

¹⁰⁶Cf. n. 107 below.

way or another.¹⁰⁷

Also, although Colossians contains enough ὅς, ὅστις and ὅσος clauses to make it possible to determine that

¹⁰⁷The first indefinite clause is the only ὅσος in this epistle, Colossians 2:1:

θέλω γὰρ ἡμᾶς εἰδέναι

ἡλίκον ἀγῶνα ἔχω ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ
καὶ ὅσοι οὐχ ἑώρακαν τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐν σαρκί,....

The ὅσοι clause is something of an anacoluthon functioning, as it does, as the third benefactive substantive with ὑπὲρ. One would in this case expect some such construction as καὶ πάσων τῶν μὴ ἑωρακότων τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐν σαρκί. The relative clause is substantival and indefinite as are all the ὅσος clauses in the Homologoumena but, in contrast to normal Pauline style, it does not precede the head clause.

The second indefinite relative clause in this epistle, Colossians 3:17, is also an anacoluthon which is unusual in several ways:

καὶ πᾶν ὃ τι ἔαν ποιῇτε ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ,
πάντα ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου Ἰησοῦ,....

This passage contains the only non-nominative form of ὅστις in the corpus, the relative being the undergoer with ποιῇτε. The only other examples of πᾶς with the relative are Rom 11:23B πᾶν δὲ ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως and Eph 3:20 ...πάντα ...ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ὧν.... The relative construction is resumed in the succeeding head clause by the plural πάντα, a very common anacoluthon (Blass-Debrunner, *Op. cit.*, para. 466, 3) though not found elsewhere in the Pauline Corpus. The other ὅστις clauses in Colossians (2:23; 3:5; 4:11) are all definite.

Colossians 3:23 is an indefinite substantival clause of Type I much like the usual indefinite and substantival relative clauses of the Homologoumena.

ὃ ἔαν ποιῇτε,

ἐκ ψυχῆς ἐργάζεσθε ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ....

In both this sentence and the one in 3:17 above, the verb in the main clause, ἐργάζεσθε and an understood ποιῇτε respectively, is qualified by a succeeding predicative participle, a characteristic trait of Colossians. They also share the distinction of having the only relatives combined with ἔαν in the Antilegomena.

The fourth indefinite relative clause, Colossians 3:25,

ὃ γὰρ ἀδικῶν κομίζεται

ὃ ἥδίκησεν,

is also a Type I substantival relative clause, but if follows, rather than precedes, the head clause.

ὅς/ὅστις is one relative and that ὅσος is not part of the same declension, and although there are parallel clauses utilizing both ὅς and ὅστις, it is quite certain that peculiar characteristics of Pauline style do not apply in the Colossians examples. "A precedes ἵνα in Colossians 2:22-23:

μὴ ἄφη μηδὲ γεύση μηδὲ θίγῃς,

ἃ ἔστιν πάντα εἰς φθοράν τῇ ἀποχρήσει,...,

ἵνα ἔστιν λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας... ¹⁰⁸

As was noted above,¹⁰⁹ the single ὅσος clause in Colossians (2:1) does not conform to the regular pattern of those clauses in the Homologoumena.

While the use of the particle ἵνα with relative in Colossians is similar to that found in the authentic epistles, the use of the more common particle, καί, is markedly different in every case except, perhaps 4:3.¹¹⁰ (1) In five of the six cases, at least, καί is part of the relative. (2) In each the particle is additive of the whole clause, rather than simply the constituent which follows it immediately. (3) The relative clauses in 1:29; 2:11, 12; and 3:7 are independent.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁸Cf. Col 4:10-11 where three names are followed by οἱ ὄντες... and οἵτινες in that order.

¹⁰⁹Cf. n. 107 above.

¹¹⁰1:29; 2:11, 12; 3:7, 15; 4:3.

¹¹¹Εἰς 8 in 1:29 has become an introductory demonstrative referring the preceding ἵνα clause and introducing a new, more personal thought. The semi-independent

The only cases of attraction in Colossians are similar to the first type in the Homologoumena, i.e. attraction to the case governed by the preposition used with the antecedent.¹¹² On the other hand, Constructio ad Sensum occurs more frequently in Colossians than in any other epistle in Corpus. Here also there is a difference: a comparison of the passage in which this variation occurs with those where it could but does not indicate that in equative clauses (i.e. the third type) the relative may receive the actual gender of the antecedent rather than the gender of the identifier.¹¹³

character of 2:11 and 12 is demonstrated by the fact that the next independent sentence, also introduced by ἵνα, is obviously parallel and connected to the relative clauses rather than the head ὅτι clause or the introductory imperative βλέπετε (2:8). That the independent sentence, connected by δέ, which follows the relative clause in 3:7 is connected to the relative clause and contrasts with it is made clear by the presence of ποτε in 3:7 and οὐν in 3:8. Thus, καί is connected to ὅς in Colossians and ὅς καί clauses are semi-independent.

¹¹² Both examples (1:6, 9) are in the adverbial relative connection ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας (=ἀφ' ἡμέρας ἐν ἧ...).

¹¹³ One of the examples is an equative clause (1:27 τοῦ μυστηρίου...ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός ἐν ὑμῖν) in which the relative receives the same gender as both the antecedent himself and the identifier. In two cases (1:25 τοῦ σώματος...ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος ... and 1:28 τοῦ μυστηρίου ...ὃν καταγγέλλομεν ...) the relative receives the gender of the identifier in an intervening equative relative clause. Colossians 2:19 (τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα...) is an example giving the relative the actual gender of the antecedent. Constructio ad Sensum could take place in the equative clauses of 1:18, 24; 2:10; 3:14; and 4:3 but does not.

Only Romans (with 19 different forms) has a more complete declension of ὅς/ὅστις than Colossian does (17) and interestingly, that epistle is the only one in the Corpus to utilize the relative to fill a greater variety of constituent slots.¹¹⁴ However, the distribution of the forms is quite different from the Homologoumena.¹¹⁵ But, when one adds a comparison of the distribution of relative functions,¹¹⁶ then the contrast between Colossians and the Homologoumena becomes quite striking.

The use of the relative as an adverbial connective is also different in Colossians. The subordinating connective relatives (1:6, 9 ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας) and the εἰς ὃ construction of 1:29 are not found in the Homologoumena. On the other hand,

¹¹⁴Cf. Table VI, p. 152 and Table VII, p. 160.

¹¹⁵The nominative is much more frequent and the accusative much less. There are no feminine plurals but the singular forms of the feminine genitive and accusative are much more frequent comparatively. So also are ᾧ-masculine (always governed by ἐν), ὅ-neuter and οὗ-neuter. In contrast to Paul, ᾧ-neuter (with or without ἐν) never appears. Neither do any forms of the genitive plural.

¹¹⁶Although the nominative is much more frequent in Colossians, in only one case is it an actor constituent (1:13 ὃς ἐργάσατο... μετέστησεν...). Cf. also 2:1 ὅσοι οὐχ ἔδραναν.... An unprecedented eleven are subjects but none with unexpressed verbs. A smaller portion are undergoers (10/45) and only one is a benefactee (1:27 οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τι...). More serve functions denoted by prepositions. Three of the ἐν ᾧ-masculine constructions serve as agency constituents but the usual Pauline δι' οὗ does not occur. Cause, purpose, and agency relative constituents are more in Col than in Homologoumena.

none of the adverbial relative connectives of the Homologoumena are employed in Colossians.

'Ev Xpictō formulations are more frequent in Colossians than in any other epistle in the corpus except Ephraians and Philippians. The force of those formulation, as well as the distribution of the manifesting forms, distinguishes Colossians and Ephesians from the Homologoumena and to a lesser degree from each other.¹¹⁷ 'Ev ō never expresses the formula in the Homologoumena, but it equals ἔν Χριστῷ four times in Colossians (1:14; 2:3, 11, 12). In 2:14 the formulation has a local force. In all the others the force is agency and it contrasts with the δὲ οὐ constructions of the Homologoumena.

4. Ephesians

Chapter I showed that Ephesians possessed certain style traits of the Homologoumena, although generally the style of that epistle contrasted with that of the authentic epistles. The same is also true at a word-level.

Ephesians is the only epistle in the Antilegomena to follow the Pauline pattern in the attraction of the

¹¹⁷ J. A. Allan, after noting that 'in Christ' formulae appear twice as often per page in Ephesians and 1½ times as often in Colossians as they do in the Homologoumena, concludes that the dominant force of the formula in Ephesians is that "it indicates Christ as the channel through whom God works his will, elects, redeems, forgives, blesses, imparts new life, builds up his church." (p. 62).

Allan ignores this phenomena in Colossians, content simply to note that Col 1:28; 2:6, 7, 10, 11 have the Pauline force. John A. Allan, "The 'In Christ' Formula in Ephesians," New Testament Studies, v (1958-59), pp. 54-62.

relative.¹¹⁸ Also ὅς/ὅστις must be one relative in Ephesians (1) since the four ὅστις clauses are all definite¹¹⁹ and the one indefinite clause is introduced by ὃν (3:20), and (2) since no slot in the declension is manifest by two forms.¹²⁰ In addition, the one clause containing the negative particle (5:4 ἃ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν) conforms to the style of the Homologoumena.¹²¹ The three examples of Constructio ad Sensum¹²² are all examples of the third type in the

¹¹⁸ Attracted relatives are found in Ephesians five times (1:6 τῆς χάριτος, ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν.; 1:8 τῆς χάριτος ἧς ἐπερίσσευσεν...; 2:10 ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς οἷς προητοίμασεν...; 3:20 ὑπερεκπερίσσευ ὃν αἰτούμεθα ἡ νοοῦμεν 4:1 τῆς κλήσεως ἧς ἐκλήθητε. At first I Cor 7:20 appears to be a close parallel and thus to suggest that ἧς is attracted from the dative. Close examination shows this to be superficial--the twice repeated connective ἐν with the imperative μὲνέτω must be local in function. In such a context κλήσις must mean 'vocation,' while here it means the act or result of the divine call. Thus this clause contains a case of the attraction of an accusative of content. On this Robertson (pp. 416, 478), Blass-Debrunner (para. 294, 2) and Bauer (p. 400) Eph 1:6, 20; and 24.

In each case the accusative has been attracted to a genitive or dative. In Ephesians attraction occurs in every case where it possibly could. However, none of them is contrary to the usual Pauline style since none of the relative clause in question has a parallel adjectival construction.

¹¹⁹ 1:23; 3:13; 4:19; 6:2.

¹²⁰ E.g. in the Homologoumena one finds ὅ/ὅτι, οἷτινες/οἷ, and ὅ/ἅτινα.

¹²¹ There the negative usually (1) follows the relative immediately, (2) negates the word which follows it, and (3) is almost invariably found in short clauses consisting of relative - negative - verb. Cf. Rom 7:28; 8:25; I Cor 15:9; II Cor 5:4.

¹²² 1:14; 3:13; 6:2. In a fourth, 4:16, ἐξ οὗ resumes in normal Ephesian style the appositive Χριστός rather than the head construction κεφαλῆ. It is not a case of attraction.

Homologoumena, i.e. the attraction of a subject relative to the gender of the identifier constituent. Why the same process has not occurred in Ephesians 1:23; 4:15; and 5:5 is not clear.

In spite of the similarities between the employment of relatives in Ephesians and the Homologoumena, the use made of relatives in Ephesians contrasts strikingly, with Paul's use of the same forms. Ephesians utilizes the relative to introduce indefinite relative clauses proportionately less than any other epistle in the Corpus.¹²³ The one example of an indefinite relative clause in Ephesians occurs in the middle of a passage which has been shaped by the style of traditional benedictive formulations. This relative clause,

Ephesians 3:20

τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑπὲρ πάντα ποιῆσαι

ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ὧν αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν... .

is one of the three passages containing the idiom πᾶς ὅς/ὅστις in the entire Corpus.¹²⁴

Also unlike the Homologoumena and Colossians, but like the other Antilegomena, the neuter nominative plural is ὅ and not ὅτινα. Naturally, since Ephesians contains one set of parallel relative clauses and no ὅσος clauses the

¹²³This trait is closely related to the peculiarities in the style of this epistle as noted in I, pp. 59-64, and especially in Excursus II.

¹²⁴The others are Rom 14:23 and Col 3:19.

Pauline style traits governing the arrangement of these phenomena do not apply in this epistle.

The use of *καί* in the relative clauses of Ephesians is like that of Colossians and quite different from that of the Homologoumena. In the first place, in all five examples¹²⁵ *καί* affects the whole clause and not just the constituent which immediately follows it. Second, in each case the particle is in fact combined with the relative, as *ὅς καί*, indicating that the relative clause is independent and perhaps co-ordinate.¹²⁶

¹²⁵1:11, 13a, 13b; 2:3, 22.

¹²⁶This is in keeping with the style of Ephesians as seen in Excursus II and Ch I, pp. 59-64. That at least three of these relatives (1:11, 13a, 13b) introduce semi-independent sentences has been noted above. They are preceded by telic constructions, which the author uses to break his interminable sentences into smaller units, and they are only loosely connected to these preceding telic constructions which contain their antecedents. The fact that *καί* in each of these three sentences is additive of the whole clause, in contrast to the Pauline practice, supports both judgment that the clauses are semi-independent and that *ὅς καί* is a single constituent.

The same judgment is probably true in Ephesians 2:3 and 22. In both cases *καί* is additive or connective for the whole clause, rather than simply the succeeding constituent. In 2:3 the relative resumes *ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας* which comes at the end of a long prepositional string introduced by *κατά*. It was noted above (pp. 61-63), that relative clauses which follow *κατά* phrases are loosely connected to the head clause. Cf. 1:9, 20; 3:11. The fact that this relative clause is in the midst of an extended period (2:1-7) does not mitigate against this judgment since, immediately after the relative clause, the author returns abruptly to the main clause and later repeats the introductory *ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν*. The relative clause in 2:22 also follows a telic construction *εἰς ναὸν ἁγίον ἐν κυρίῳ*. It may also be independent, although conclusion is not as evident in this case.

With regard to the distribution of the forms of the relative, Ephesians stands in contrast to any of the Homologoumena which have enough relative forms for comparison.¹²⁷ Yet that distribution is quite in keeping with the style of this epistle. Moreover, when the differences in the distribution of forms are combined with the contrasting distribution of relative functions,¹²⁸ then the noteworthy

¹²⁷Ephesians makes less use of plural forms, proportionately speaking, than any other epistle. Only I Thessalonians with four relatives makes less use of all neuter forms. "A-accusative and ϕ -masculine are lacking; $\delta\upsilon$ (6:22), δ -accusative (3:4) and ϕ -neuter (4:30) are each found one time; $\delta\varsigma$ (1:14; 4:15) and $\omicron\upsilon$ -masculine (3:15; 4:16, both with $\epsilon\zeta$) are found only twice. These are usually the most common forms in the homologoumena. On the other hand, ϕ -masculine occurs nine times, always governed by $\epsilon\nu$. In fact all the datives except $\omicron\iota\varsigma$ in 2:10 (an undergoer) are governed by $\epsilon\nu$. This is in keeping with the great frequency of that preposition in Ephesians. Feminine forms are more frequent here than elsewhere in the Corpus. $\alpha\iota\varsigma$ is found in Ephesians 2:2 and II Thessalonians 1:4. This is, of course, a result of the author's fondness for abstract nouns.

¹²⁸A much larger portion of the relative functions are denoted by prepositions in this epistle. Especially striking are eight agency and two instrumental datives governed by $\epsilon\nu$. Not only is this far in excess of any other epistle, but the agency $\epsilon\nu \phi$ contrasts with the Pauline $\delta\iota' \omicron\upsilon$. Seven serve as subjects in their clauses, a high average. Source ($\epsilon\zeta \omicron\upsilon$) is more common than usual. Seven relatives are used as subjects, but never with unexpressed verbs. On the other hand, the most common relative functions for the Homologoumena are much less common proportionately in Ephesians. The relative is actor only once (4:19 $\omicron\iota\tau\iota\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma \dots \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\alpha\iota \dots$), the lowest proportion in the corpus. A smaller proportion (9) are used as undergoers than elsewhere. Only one benefactor (2:20 $\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho \omicron\upsilon \pi\rho\omicron\beta\epsilon\upsilon\omega \epsilon\nu \acute{\alpha}\lambda\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota$) and one possessive (3:7 $\tau\omicron\upsilon \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\upsilon \omicron\upsilon \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\eta\nu \delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma \dots$) relative constituent occur in Ephesians. The relative is never used as an adverbial subordinating clause connective in this epistle.

divergence between the style of Ephesians and that of the Homologoumena becomes evident.

Ephesians uses ἐν Χριστῷ formulations twice as often as the average in the Homologoumena, containing the most examples of any epistle (35). The use of these formulations in Ephesians is more like Colossians than any other epistle, yet different from that epistle also. Although many different types of this formula appear in Ephesians the most characteristic one can be paraphrased "God in Christ (or through Christ) did this." In this construction, ἐν Χριστῷ expresses the intermediate agent. The ἐν ᾧ constructions (1:7, 11, 13a, 13b; 2:21, 22; 3:12; and by analogy 4:30) are all agency constructions referring to God's act mediated through Christ. Such relative constructions are found only in Ephesians and Colossians, and are in contrast to δι' οὗ in the Homologoumena.

5. I Timothy

A word-level survey of the relatives in I Timothy indicates that at many points the style of that epistle resembles that of the Homologoumena (at least more than Colossians and Ephesians do). Nonetheless, at every point, the differences in style between this epistle and the Homologoumena are obvious. This, of course, confirms the conclusions of Chapter I.

With a likely eleven indefinite relative clauses

(11/2b),¹²⁹ I Timothy has roughly the same ratio of those clauses as Romans, i.e. only slightly less than the average of the Homologoumena. Whether ὅστις retains its classical indefinite character or not, cannot be answered unambiguously. However, the evidence would seem to indicate the ὅς/ὅστις is single relative.¹³⁰

There are no exact parallels in I Timothy to the Pauline practice of following a ὅστις clause with a parallel ὅς clause. The single ὅσοις clause is in the normal Pauline pattern, i.e. substantival, indefinite and preceding the head construction:

ὅσοι εἰσὶν ὑπὸ ζυγὸν δοῦλοι,

¹²⁹The problem of identification arises out of the author's penchant for using relatives to resume a compound list of vices or virtues in a non-articular form and with a general meaning, but apparently taken concretely and explicitly by the author. The phenomena which seldom occurs elsewhere in our corpus is found in I Timothy 1:4 (οὔτινες), 6; 6:5, 9 (αὔτινες), 21. Analogous examples in which the vice or virtue is not compounded are found in I Timothy 1:7, 15, 19; 2:10; 4:3; 6:10(?); 2:1; 3:5. The antecedent for I Timothy 6:12 and Titus 1:2 is ζωῆς αἰωνίου and for I Timothy 6:10 it is ἡ φιλαργυρία. In their contexts these are probably definite. Because of the generalizing nature of the other antecedents, they are taken as indefinite.

¹³⁰ὅστις does not occur often enough for one to say with certainty whether it maintains its classical indefinite character. Two of the three (1:4; 6:1) are indefinite, and the third is used as the subject of a ὅ ἐστιν expegetical clause with a feminine identifier. Nonetheless, since (1) ἥτις does replace ὅ (or ὅς) in 3:15, (2) eight of the eleven indefinite clauses are introduced by forms of ὅς and (3) equivalent forms of ὅς and ὅστις are not found in the epistle, it seems likely that ὅστις is not the indefinite relative but rather furnishes exactly those forms of declension of ὅς/ὅστις in which ὅς differs from the definite article only in accent.

τοὺς ἰδίους δεσπότας πάσης τιμῆς ἀξιόους ἡγείσθωσαν,

ἵνα μὴ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ διδασκαλία βλασφημῇται.¹³²

In I Timothy no particles are placed immediately after the relative and none are part of the relative in that epistle.

Constructio ad Sensum is utilized by this author in I Timothy 3:15.¹³² Here the relative in a clause is attracted to the gender of the identifier (i.e. the third type in the Homologoumena):

ἵνα εἰδῇς

¹³¹This is rather like I Cor 1:20; Gal 3:10; 6:12; Phl 3:15.

¹³²I Timothy 3:16 may be an example of Constructio ad Sensum. There are parallels of a sort in Romans 1:24; Galatians 4:19; and Philemon 10, i.e. the relative agrees with the actual gender rather than the syntactical gender. But, it is really different from all of these:

καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶν τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον·
 ὃς [ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί,
 [ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι,
 [ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις,
 [ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν,
 [ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ,
 [ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ.

If this passage is a case of Constructio ad Sensum, one almost must assume the Colossian apposition between μυστήριον and Χριστός (1:27 τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὃς ἐστὶν Χριστός ἐν ὑμῖν 2:2 τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ). In fact, the closest parallel to the whole sentence is Ephesians 5:32 (τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν, ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν). In any case, the anticipated antecedent of the relative is Χριστός. Therefore, it is likely that the sentence is an anacoluthon with the relative clause functioning as an independent sentence which gives the content of μυστήριον and that ὃς is not an example of Constructio ad Sensum resuming that substantive. This anacoluthon has form-critical implications which will find additional support in Chapter III.

πῶς δεῖ ἐν οἴνῳ θεοῦ ἀναστρέφεσθαι,
 ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος,...¹³³

There are no cases of the attraction of the relative in I Timothy. In this way the author departs from Pauline style because, in an epistle of the Homologoumena, we would expect attraction in at least four passages (4:3, 6; 6:15; 21).

Even the distribution of relative forms and relative functions manifests this tendency to resemble the Homologoumena at times, while departing at others.

The distribution of forms in I Timothy is somewhat different from what one expects in the Homologoumena yet some forms appear that are otherwise found only in Homologoumena in our Corpus. The only examples of feminine in the corpus are in this epistle (1:6; 6:4). Αἵτινες, which occurs elsewhere only in Philippians 4:3, is found twice in I Timothy (1:4; 6:9). On the other hand, ἥ is found in the majority of the Homologoumena, occurring nine times, but is found in the Antilegomena only in I Timothy 4:6. Feminine forms occur with greater frequency in this epistle (11/25) than they do in the homologoumena.

The distribution of relative functions in I Timothy is fairly close to what one would expect in the Homologoumena.

¹³³This type of Constructio ad Sensum is very common, esp. in Col (e.g. 1:22) and Eph (e.g. 1:14; 3:13; 6:2), but is also quite similar to Phl 1:28.

But again there are peculiar usages. On one hand, undergoers and actors in that order are the primary functions; but on the other hand, three serve as undergoers with a participle within the clauses (1:19; 6:10, 21). This usage has no parallels outside the Pastorals and, as we shall see later, these sentences are stereotyped in every way.¹³⁴ Two relative serving purpose functions (2:7; 6:12) are more than usual. The use of the relative as a genitive of the whole (1:15, 20) is found only here and in II Timothy (1:15; 2:17) in the Corpus. None of the relative phrases are used as subordinating clause connectives.

6. II Timothy

At a word-level also, II Timothy exhibits more of the style traits of the Homologoumena than any other Antilegomenon. Yet the use made of the idioms coupled with the peculiarities of II Timothy argue that it is not authentic.¹³⁵

Ten out of twenty-three relative clauses in II Timothy are indefinite.¹³⁶ This ratio is the same as that in I Timothy and near the ratio in Romans. "Ος/ὅστις is obviously a single relative.¹³⁷ However, II Timothy has

¹³⁴Cf. Chapter III, pp. 265-267 and n. 134.

¹³⁵Thus the evidence at a word-level corroborates the conclusions at a phrase-level.

¹³⁶1:13, 15, 18; 2:2a, 2b, 7, 17, 20a, 20b; 3:14. This list includes the only ὅσοις clause and one of the three ὅστις clauses (2:2b).

¹³⁷The reasons here are the same as those in I Timothy.

no cases where both ὅς and ὅστις refers to the same antecedent.¹³⁸

The one ὅσος clause conforms to the Pauline pattern:

II Timothy 1:18

καὶ ὅσα ἐν Ἐφέσῳ διηκόνησεν,
βέλτιον σὺ γινώσκεις.

The relative clause is a substantival clause of Type I functioning as the undergoer. The neuter accusative plural ὅσα is found only here and in Romans 3:19.

Μέν, δέ, and καί are the only particles which immediately follow the relative in II Timothy. Μέν and δέ are part of the relative construction in the only antithetical clauses in the Antilegomena, I Timothy 2:20:

ἐν μεγάλῃ δὲ οἰκῇ οὐκ ἔστιν μόνον σκεῦῃ χρυσᾷ καὶ ἀργυρᾷ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ξύλινα καὶ ὀστράκινα,

καὶ ἃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν

ἃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν.¹³⁹

Καί follows the relative immediately in two

¹³⁸ 2:17-18 only appears to be an exception; ὧν resumes αὐτῶν and οὔτινες resumes ὁ γέναιος καὶ φίλητος.

¹³⁹ These antithetical clauses may be independent. The initial καὶ connective and the resumption of σκεῦος εἰς τιμὴν in the next sentence would suggest this. However, nothing in the context necessitates that they be treated as independent. The δέ after ὧν τρόπον in 3:18 connects the entire sentence with the preceding sentence.

passages, 1:12a (δι' ἣν αἰτίαν καὶ ταῦτα πάσχα...) ¹⁴⁰ and 4:15 (ὅν καὶ σὺ φυλάσσω). ¹⁴¹ Although καί is additive in both and, therefore, used in the same way as the Homologoumena employs this particle (i.e. additive with the following constituent), neither of these two clauses have any close parallels in the accepted epistles.

II Timothy 3:14 is the only example of attraction in this epistle:

οὐ δὲ μένε

ἐν οἷς ἔμαθες καὶ ἐπιστάθης...

It is much like examples of this passage is much like examples of attraction in the Homologoumena. ¹⁴² Attraction is not possible in any other passage in this epistle. Constructio ad Sensum and inverse attraction do not occur. The incorporation of the antecedent is found in both of the subordinating clause connectives δι' ἣν αἰτίαν (1:6a, 12a) and ὅν τρόπον (3:8). The antecedent follows the relative immediately as it does ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας and ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνου.

The distribution of the forms of the relative

¹⁴⁰ Καί is probably additive of what follows emphasizing that the writer not only was appointed a preacher, apostle, and teacher for the sake of the gospel but that he also suffered these things for that very reason.

¹⁴¹ Καί is obviously additive with σὺ in a clause in which σὺ contrasts emphatically with μοι and ὁ κύριος.

¹⁴² This example of the attraction of accusative to dative matches the first type noted in the Homologoumena, i.e. the attraction of the relative to the case governed by a preposition when the relative clause is used substantively with that preposition.

offers little that distinguishes II Timothy. The Antilegomena's only ϕ -neuters, a common form in the Homologoumena, are found in II Timothy 2:9 and Ephesians 4:30. Three passages employing ω -masculine (1:13, 15; 2:17) are more than one would normally expect.

The distribution of relative functions in II Timothy is more like Ephesians than any other epistles, although proportionately more relatives serve nuclear functions in II Timothy and none fill an agency slot. Relatives acting as genitives of the whole are found only in II Timothy 1:15 and 2:17 and in I Timothy (2x). This accounts for two of the three ω -masculine relatives. The use of relatives to resume divine names does not contrast with the Homologoumena.¹⁴³

The use of the relative in the causal connective $\delta\iota' \eta\upsilon \alpha\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ is found only in II Timothy 1:6a, 12a and Titus 1:13. In all three cases it introduces an independent sentence in which $\delta\iota' \eta\upsilon \alpha\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ refers back to the preceding sentence. The Pauline equivalent is $\delta\iota\alpha \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$.¹⁴⁴ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ as the connective for a comparative clause is found only in II Timothy 3:8.

¹⁴³The only relatives which refer to either God or Jesus Christ are the three examples of ϕ -masculine (1:3, 12b; 4:18), all without preposition. 1:12b is in a substantival relative clause. Whether the understood antecedent is $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ or $\text{'I}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ cannot be determined. The antecedent in 1:3 is $\tau\omega \theta\epsilon\omega$ and in 4:18 is an ambiguous $\delta \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\acute{o}\varsigma$.

¹⁴⁴cf. I, p. 68-69n. 77.

7. Titus

Titus exhibits the same ambivalence of relationships to the Homologoumena at a word-level that it (and the other Pastoral Epistles) at a phrase-level. Some of its traits are quite similar to the characteristic style of the Homologoumena. Yet its style, both in general and in particular, contrasts with the accepted epistles.

The ratio of indefinite relative clauses (4/10)¹⁴⁵ is normal in the Pastorals and in the Homologoumena. That ὅς/ὅστις is a single relative in Titus seems likely in 1:11 and 12a:

εἰσὶν γὰρ πολλοὶ ἐνυπότακτοι, ματαιλόγοι καὶ
φρεναπάται, μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς,

οὓς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν,

οἵτινες ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν

διδάσκοντες

& μὴ δεῖ

(διδάσκοντες) αἰσχροῦ κέρβους χάριν.¹⁴⁶

Yet the Pauline practice of introducing the first clause with ὅστις and later clauses with ὅς is not followed here.

¹⁴⁵1:11a, 11b, 11c; 2:1. These include the only ὅστις clause (1:11b) in this epistle. "Ὅσος does not occur in Titus.

¹⁴⁶Both οὓς and οἵτινες resume the same antecedent: οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς. The question cannot be settled with certainty because in the classical period ὅστις often introduced relative clauses of cause or justification. The only relative clause in Titus which gives cause in the οἵτινες clause is 1:12a.

The only particle that occurs immediately after the relative in Titus is μή in 1:12b (see above).¹⁴⁷ This is the only relative containing μή in the entire corpus.

In an epistle of the Homologoumena one would expect attraction in at least four passages in Titus;¹⁴⁸ yet only in 3:6 has attraction occurred. It cannot be determined under what conditions the writer did or did not employ attraction.

Constructio ad Sensum and inverse attraction are not found in Titus. The only example of the incorporation of the antecedent is the subordinating connective δι' ἣν αἰτίαν in 1:13.

All of the relatives in Titus, except the attracted undergoer οὗ-neuter in 3:6, are either nominative or accusative. In spite of this eight forms appear (in ten relative clauses). As one might expect, given the distribution of forms, three of the relatives in Titus are actors and six undergoers.¹⁴⁹ The only relative used with a preposition occurs in the stereotyped causal connective δι' ἣν

¹⁴⁷It negates δεῖ. This sentence is in traditional classical style since μή was the negative of indefinite relative clauses in that period in 1:12b is indefinite.

¹⁴⁸1:2 ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἣν ἐπηγγείλατο...
1:3 ἐν κηρύγματι, ὃ ἐπιστεύθη ἐγώ...
3:5 ἐξ ἔργων... ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς,
3:6 πνεύματος ἁγίου οὗ ἐξέχεεν....

¹⁴⁹This compares favorably with I Th and Phm, but contrasts with II Th, which employs the same number of relative clauses.

αἰτίαν found only in Titus 1:13 and II Timothy 1:6a, 12a.

Even the use of the relative to resume a divine name is both alike and different from the Homologoumena. The one relative in Titus which resumes the divine name is found with an unusual antecedent in 2:13-14:

...τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ
ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν... .

The relative clause is a traditional statement found in Galatians 1:4 and I Timothy 2:6 (both with attributival participles). The antecedent in II Timothy, however, is unique in the corpus.¹⁵⁰ The only Antilegomena examples of διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ^{are} as an agency construction; a common construction in the Homologoumena are found in Titus 3:6 and Ephesians 1:5.

C. CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter, limited to the analysis and description of the declension, forms and functions, and distribution of the relative themselves, a variety of useful conclusions emerge. These generally support the conclusions of Chapter I. The evidence here is less exciting, but almost as conclusive as that found in the earlier chapter. On occasion, of course, the evidence for the conclusions of

¹⁵⁰ Σωτήρ occurs only twelve times in the Corpus: Phl 3:20; Eph 5:23; I Tm 1:1; 2:3; 4:10; II Tm 1:10; Tit 1:3, 4; 2:10, 13; 3:4, 6. In Phl, Eph, and II Tim, as well as Tit 1:4, 3:6, the appositive with σωτήρ is Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. In all the examples in I Tim as well as Tit 1:3; 2:10; 3:4, the antecedent is θεός. In Tit 2:13 Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ apparently is syntactically in apposition with τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος.

both chapters overlap.

1. The Homogeneity of the Style of the Homologoumena

The Introduction to this chapter highlighted eight questions which were asked about Paul's use of the relatives at a word-level. A clear answer to each of these eight questions, it was expected, would provide an objective description of Paul's use (style) of relatives for comparison with the style of the disputed epistles.

These eight questions were pursued throughout the Homologoumena and clear answers were obtained.¹⁵¹ What emerged was a picture of the Pauline usage which showed great constancy and homogeneity, both in general and in particular. Even the Pauline peculiarities were usually attested in three or more epistles. Such a consistent and homogenous usage forms an adequate basis for comparisons with the disputed letters.

2. The Antilegomena Contrast

The styles of the Antilegomena contrast with the style of the Homologoumena, both generally and in particulars. There are a number of common idioms in the Homologoumena which are found seldom, if at all, in the Antilegomena.¹⁵² The reverse is also true. Furthermore, each Antilegomenon departed significantly at crucial points from the style of

¹⁵¹Cf. II, pp.130-170 and esp. the summary on pp. 167-170.

¹⁵²Cf. II, B, 1 (pp. 171-173).

the Homologoumena. Although the degree of difference and the kinds of variation fluctuated from epistle to epistle¹⁵³ the overall results supported and increased the evidence against the authenticity of each of the Antilegomena.

3. Comparison of the Styles of the Antilegomena

In many ways the most significant observations to come from this chapter are those which support the statements of Chapter I and (1) the relative distance of the styles of the Antilegomena from the Homologoumena and (2) the comparison of Colossians-Ephesians and the Pastorals as two separate clusters in the Antilegomena. In this chapter, the Pastorals emerge as being stylistically closer to the Homologoumena than either II Thessalonians or Colossians-Ephesians. Also the similarity of Colossians to Ephesians and of the Pastorals to each other comes out more strongly at this level than it did at a phrase-level. A comparison of Colossians and Ephesians to each other and of the Pastorals will substantiate these statements.

In contrast to the evidence seen in Chapter I Colossians and Ephesians seldom agree with the Homologoumena against each other, but when they do sometimes Colossians¹⁵⁴

¹⁵³Cr. II, B. 2-7 (pp. 173-197).

¹⁵⁴E.g. Although both have a much smaller ratio of indefinite clauses than one finds in the Homologoumena, Col has more than Eph. Col is the only epistle in the Antilegomena to use the particle *ἐάν* with the relative. It alone has a relative attracted to the actual gender of the antecedent (2:19; the second type in the Homologoumena), although both frequently have the relative in the gender of the identifier. The two cases of attraction and

and sometimes Ephesians¹⁵⁵ is nearer to Paul's style. Nonetheless, at a word-level, the relatives of Colossians and Ephesians are more like any epistle or group of epistles in the Corpus.¹⁵⁶

incorporation in Col (ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας 1:6, 9) are rather similar to ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ in Rom 2:16. Although both epistles, like most of the Antilegomena use ἄ-nominative, Col 2:23 alone uses αἰτιᾶ-nominative, the usual form in the Homologoumena. Col also makes heavier use of nominative and accusative forms than Eph. Furthermore, Col utilizes the relative as an agent more near the ratio of such usage in the Homologoumena.

¹⁵⁵E.g. Eph does not, in contrast to Colossians, combine ὅς and ὅστις clauses in that order. Its failure to depart from Pauline style in the employment of ὅοος clauses, contra Colossians 2:1, may simply be its failure to employ ὅοος. All five examples of attraction fit the Pauline canons of style. Ephesians offers Constructio ad Sensum less often than Colossians. ὁ-neuter and ὧν, common forms in the Homologoumena but missing in Colossians, are found in this epistle. The proportion of subjects to other relative functions is closer to the Pauline ratio (Cf. Gal) than is Col.

¹⁵⁶Several shared relative idioms stand out in the comparison of these two epistles. Both make heavy use of ὅς καί to introduce semi-independent relative clauses. (Col 1:29; 2:11, 12; 3:7, 15; 4:3; Eph 1:11, 13a, 13b; 2:3, 22). This phenomenon may be shared with II Thessalonians (εἰς ὃ καί - 1:11; 2:4) but is not found elsewhere in the corpus. (See the argument in Chapter III on the use of καί in the relative clauses of the Homologoumena). The heavy utilization of ὅς as the subject of a copula verb, always with the verb expressed, marks these two epistles, although they share this to lesser degrees with Galatians and II Timothy. However, the proportionately limited use of actor and undergoer relative constituents coupled with this high ratio of subjects has no parallels in the corpus. Related to this is the fact that both epistles employ Constructio ad Sensum with equative clauses, not only more frequently, but with a larger proportion of the equative clauses than do any others in the Corpus. Very few plural forms are found in either but both make heavy use of feminine forms in the singular. Both epistles manifest a great variety of relative forms and constituent functions (exceeded only by Romans which has over twice as many clauses as either). Also a larger proportion of the relatives manifesting these

That these two epistles share so many striking characteristics must be noted in any conclusions about the inter-relationship within the corpus. It does not mitigate against the earlier observation that sometimes Colossians, and sometimes Ephesians, is closer to the style of the Homologoumena. In fact, the very great frequency of ἐν Χριστῷ formulations in both these epistles supports the earlier observation that the style traits of the Homologoumena were regularly being imitated and overdone by the writer(s) of these epistles.

The observations in Chapter I on the inter-relationships among the Pastorals and between these epistles and the Homologoumena receives added support in this chapter. The Pastorals as a whole, and II Timothy in particular, possess more of the style traits of the Homologoumena than do II Thessalonians, Colossians or Ephesians.¹⁵⁷ On the other hand, the Pastorals contain

functions in each epistle are joined to prepositions than is found in any other epistle. Datives are employed heavily in both epistles, almost invariably in phrases with ἐν. The most striking phenomena which they share is the use of ἐν ᾧ-masculine as an agency constituent resuming ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Not only is this manifestation of the ἐν Χριστῷ formula unique to these epistles and in contrast to the οὐ of the Homologoumena, but also the use of the ἐν Χριστῷ formula as an agency constituent is very unusual outside of Colossians and Ephesians.

¹⁵⁷All three have about the same ratio of indefinite clauses (40-45%) as is found in the Homologoumena. Both of the ὅσοις clauses (I Tim 6:1; II Tim 1:18) are in the characteristic Pauline form and both are indefinite. In fact ὅσα-accusative is found only in II Timothy 1:18 and Romans 3:19. The only place where μέν and ὅτι are used as part of the relative constituent is in II Timothy 2:20.

several relative idioms, some of which they share, which are either not found in or contrast to those in the Homologoumena.¹⁵⁸

Having examined all this evidence the conclusion that the style of the Pastorals is closer to the Homologoumena, than is the style of Colossians or Ephesians, is considerably strengthened. In fact, based on the evidence presented in this chapter alone the arrangement in terms of closeness to

The single example in the Antilegomena of the attraction of the relative to the case governed by the preposition when the relative clause is substantival is II Timothy 3:14; this first type of attraction is common in Paul. In general the Pauline ratios are maintained in the distribution of both relative forms and relative junctions (undergoers, actors, and subject predominate in that order). *Ἀλλ' ὅτι* and *ὅτι* are found only here and in the Homologoumena. *ὅς*-masculine is found frequently in the Homologoumena and twice each in I and II Timothy. None of the *ἐν Χριστῷ* formulations are manifested by *ἐν ᾧ*. *ὅτι*-masculine is regularly without prepositional connective when it refers to God.

¹⁵⁸They do not follow the Pauline arrangement of *ὅτι*/*ὅς* in parallel clauses (Tit 1:11-12a). Only Titus 1:26 in our Corpus uses *μή* with the relative generally the Pastorals use almost no particles with relatives. Constructio ad Sensum is rare (only 3:15); so is the attraction of the relative (exceptions: II Tim 3:14 and Tit 3:6). In Pauline letters one would expect attraction at least seven times in I Timothy and Titus where it does not occur. The only examples of incorporation are in the peculiar clause connective *δι' ἣν αἰτέω*, found in both II Timothy 1:6a, 12a and Titus 1:13. Feminine forms are proportionately more common in I Timothy and Titus than they are in the Homologoumena. The only times that the relative is used as undergoer with a participle subordinate to the relative clause is I Timothy 1:19; 6:10, 21. The peculiar use of the relative as a genitive of the whole is found in both I Timothy 2:2; 6:12 and II Timothy 1:15; 2:17. *ὅς* *πρόσθεν* is used as a comparative clause connective only in II Timothy 3:6.

Pauline style would be:

Homol. - II Tim - Tit - I Tim - II Th¹⁵⁹ - Eph - Col

4. Traditional Liturgical Formulas and Style

This chapter has not sought at every point to discover evidence to distinguish the alleged liturgical or hymnic materials, because no one has claimed that the relatives in such material were peculiar. It should be noted, however, that I Timothy 3:16, as was seen above,¹⁶⁰ does not fit the style patterns found throughout the Corpus. This would, perhaps, strengthen the claim that it is alien to its context.

¹⁵⁹Although II Thessalonians has fewer strange relative idioms than the other Antilegomena, it is located in the above in the fifth place because its few (13) relatives represent a proportionately larger number of divergencies.

¹⁶⁰Cf. II, n. 132 above.

CHAPTER III

CONSTITUENT ORDER IN THE PAULINE RELATIVE CLAUSES

To deal effectively with the relationship between the internal composition of the Pauline relative clauses and the various questions of authenticity in the Pauline Corpus one must deal with three basic issues: (1) Is the order of constituents in the relative clauses of the Homologoumena as free as has been alleged for Greek generally? (2) What factors or principles, if any, do determine the constituent order of these clauses? (3) Are the same patterns found and do the same principles apply with much the same regularity in the Antilegomena? To be able to establish a negative answer for the first question would have significance for the study of Greek. However, it is also clear that the first question cannot be answered without an unequivocal answer to the second.

These questions of necessity take us into areas of Greek language that are largely uncharted. One reason for this is the universality of the assumption that there are no rules or patterns in Greek word order.¹ A second

¹R. Kühner (Syntaktische Forschungen, IV, p. 154f.) and G. Kaibel (Stil Und Text der Politika Athenaiou des Aristoteles. Berlin, 1893. p. 96) are but giving expression to the usual opinion when they say, "Man hat im allgemeinen den Eindruck, dass die Stellung frei ist," or "Allgemein gültige Gesetze für die Wortfolge gibt es im Griechischen kaum". Both are quoted by Hjalmar Frisk in Studien zur griechischen Wortstellung, Götterborgs Högskolas Arsskrift XXXIX, 1 (Götterborg, 1932), p. 8.

factor is the dearth of scholarly work on Greek word-order, a situation made worse by the frequent contradictions and weaknesses found in the works which have appeared.² Third, most studies of word-order have been just that, studies of word-order.

The most significant way that this study of the order within Greek clauses differs from earlier studies deals directly with that third problem. Rather than suppose that clauses are composed of individual words, this chapter is predicated on the assumption that a clause is a string of constituents manifested by particular constructions (not simple words necessarily) of different kinds. Thus the relative clause in Galatians 2:5, which possesses fifteen

²The history of such efforts has been traced from different viewpoints by Frisk (*op. cit.*, pp 5-12) and also by Alfred Loepfe (*Die Wortstellung im griechischen Sprechsatz erklärt an Stücken aus Platon und Menander*. (Freiburg in der Schweiz, 1940, pp. 1-22)).

It is sufficient here to note the weaknesses that these two authors expose. Such studies (1) often used material which is not homogeneous, (2) frequently came to contradictory conclusions based on the same evidence, (3) did not distinguish between the various levels of sentence phenomena, (4) made heavy use of subjective and judgmental categories, (5) were often careless in the use of terms and analogs, (6) were generally limited to nuclear constituents, (7) had too great a reverence for statistics as self-interpreting and self-authenticating, (8) were often careless in methodology, and (9) usually devised rules that did little to illuminate either the supporting examples or the numerous exceptions.

An awareness of these difficulties causes Frisk to admit the limitations of his study, although he stresses the value of his description of linguistic usage (*op. cit.*, p. 6). Loepfe, on the other hand, is more optimistic and ambitious (*op. cit.*, "Vorwort").

words, is composed of five constituents manifested by five different kinds of constructions:

οἷς / οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν / εὔξαμεν / τῇ ὑποταγῇ, /
 ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαμείνη πρὸς ὑμᾶς.
 +BEN:r +TEM:neg & pph +PRD:vat +UND:nph +PUR:cl

Each of these five constituents may be manifested in other clauses by word-level and/or phrase level constructions. TEM, UND, and PUR may also be manifested in some cases by subordinate clauses.³

A. CONSTITUENT ORDER IN THE HOMOLOGOUMENA

Although many factors have been shown to influence constituent order in different texts outside the Pauline Corpus,⁴ it is quite clear that four factors or

³This view of the grammar of the sentence is the result of the studies of Zellig Harris, String Analysis of Sentence Structure. Papers in Formal Linguistics, No. 1 (The Hague, 1954), as well as Kenneth Pike, Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior, Rev. ed. (The Hague, n.d.), and Robert Longacre, Grammar Discovery Procedures (The Hague, 1964), esp. pp. 12-23.

The failure to perceive that sentences are composed of strings of constituents (rather than words) and to distinguish hierarchy in grammatical structure, i.e. word-level, phrase-level, clause-level, is a serious weakness of many studies of Greek word order. On the other hand, cf. K-G, pp. 595-6. When Kühner says that the normal order in Greek sentences is subject - attributive - time - location - object - manner - predicate and that such constituents may be represented by a word, phrase or clause, he is speaking of constituent order, not simply word order. The same is also true of Schwyzler, pp. 693-696.

⁴K. J. Dover, Greek Word Order (Cambridge, 1960) pp. 3-4 suggests: (1) In Greek there are phonological determinants; e.g. the Greek aversion to hiatus and the fondness for paranomasia are well known. (2) There are also lexical determinants; e.g. in Greek certain words will not begin a clause and certain others will not close a clause. (3) Some

principles will explain the constituent order of almost every relative clause in the Homologoumena. These factors are Behaghel's Law, the type of manifesting construction, the type of relative clause, and emphasis. A fifth factor, the presence or influence or traditional materials, may affect constituent order in a few clauses.

are the stylistic determinants, e.g. chiasmus, in Paul's letters have been thoroughly examined (N. W. Lund, Chiasmus in the New Testament, A Study in Formgeschichte (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1942)).

(4) Morphological determinants since relative words (or morphemes) usually stand at the beginning of relative clauses.

(5) There may be syntactical determinants; many studies of Greek word order conclude that subjects precede verbs (Cf. Loepfe, op. cit., pp. 1-22; and Frisk, op. cit., pp. 5-12. Frisk also comes to this conclusion).

(6) Logical determinants are also possible, e.g. Weil argues that the most important thing, the Thema, comes at the end in simple declarative sentences (Henri Weil, De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparees aux langues modernes.

(Paris: 1844, 1869, 1879) pp. 19-35. This study forms the basic presupposition for Loepfe's constructive dissertation). (7) Semantic determinants may be expected, i.e. hypothetically, final = 'to exist' may always stand final in its clause.

(8) Social and Ceremonial determinants abound in many languages, e.g. in English the first person personal pronoun regularly comes last in a series. (9) Emotive determinants are common in many languages. (10) Determinants from the individual speaker's history are also to be expected. (11) In addition to those suggested by Dover, one should recognize the possibility of a Suspense determinant, such as Schwyzer suggests (Schwyzer, pp. 615 and 691), by which information essential to understanding the situation is postponed to the end of the sentence to create tension.

(12) According to Dover (op. cit., p. 4), Ammann and Havers noted mimetic determinants, i.e. "word denoting sudden noise or movement precede the words one finds frequent traditional determinants, i.e. word orders affected by Old Testament and other authoritative parallels.

1. Behaghel's Law

The most obvious thing that one notes on an initial analysis of both the relative clauses of the Homologoumena and of the sentences that contain these clauses is the frequency with which word-level constructions precede phrase-level constructions and phrase-level constructions precede clause-level constructions in almost any given sentence or clause. This observation, which states that lighter or shorter constructions come earlier, and heavier or longer ones come later in Greek sentences, has been noted before and is known as Behaghel's Law.⁵

Behaghel's Law means that the order: +relative +particles +nuclear constituents +prepositional phrases +subordinate clauses, is strikingly frequent. An example of this order would be I Corinthians 2:13:

ἀ καὶ λαλοῦμεν [οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς...λόγοις,
ἀλλ' ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος,
πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες.

Furthermore, the order of particles, nuclear constituents, prepositional phrases, and subordinate clauses relative to each other in each type of relative clause is remarkably

⁵ Otto Behaghel, "Beziehungen zwischen Umfang und Reihenfolge von Satzgliedern," Indogermanische Forschungen, XXV (Berlin, 1909), pp. 110ff. Cf. Also his Deutsche Syntax I - IV (Heidelberg: 1923-32); and his "Zur Stellung des Verbs im Germanischen und Indogermanischen," Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung, LVI (Berlin: 1929), pp. 276ff. I am unable to determine whether Behaghel was the first to call attention to the Greek propensity for putting heavier constructions later in the sentence. I refer to this observation as Behaghel's Law, following the practice of Kühner and Gerth.

regular. Although the elements of the outline may vary according to clause type,⁶ the basic outline of the Pauline relative clause seems to be: +relative +particles +nuclear constituents +other word-level constituents +phrase-level constituents +clause-level constituents.⁷ That it is the weight or length of the constituent and not simply the level (as the above order might suggest) is shown by the placing of the undergoer at the far right of Galatians 5:21:⁸

ἀ / προλέγω / ὑμῖν /
καθὼς προεῖπον /
ὅτι οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες...οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν.
+UND:r +PRD:vat +BEN:prn +CMP:cl +UND:cl

⁶E.g. the intransitive clauses usually have the actor before the predicate (Rom 14:21 ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀδελφός σου προσκίπτε). Modal clauses often have a substantive between the modal auxiliary and the infinitival predicate (II Cor 2:3 ἀφ' ὧν ἔδει με χαίρειν).

⁷The specific order is + relative + connective and/or modal particles + transitional temporal particles + personal pronouns in the nominative + negative + pronouns in accusative case and in propositional phrases also + adverbs, adjectives or other complements + prepositional phrases (in this order: Benefactor-goal, comparative-manner, agent-cause, instrument, source-location, time, accompaniment, referent, purpose-result) + subordinate clauses and verbal constructions in roughly the same order as the prepositional phrases. (It is impossible to ascertain from the relative clauses themselves whether the order of clauses repeats the order of prepositional phrases or completes that order. No combination of prepositional phrases and subordinate clauses in a single relative clause overlap in the order suggested above.)

⁸Cf. also I Cor 1:8; 10:13a; 12:28; II Cor 2:4; 8:22; 9:2; Gal 5:21; and perhaps also Phl 2:6-8. In each of these cases a nuclear constituent comes later than expected.

2. Construction Class and Constituent Order

The second observation that one makes about constituent order, when one surveys all of the relative clauses in the Homologoumena, is that certain words and/or construction clauses show strong predilections for particular positions in the clauses. For example, verbs, words introduced by conjunctive and negative particles, modal particles, transitional temporal adverbs, and nominative forms of personal pronouns usually follow the relative immediately. Other forms of the personal pronouns, both with and without prepositions, are usually found immediately after or immediately before the verb. In each case we must examine the evidence.

The Verb in the Second Position--In no less than 204 out of 238 Pauline relative clauses, the verb either follows the relative immediately or stands as near the beginning of the clause as possible. Of course, this figure includes the forty-four (44) relative clauses which have only two constituents (e.g. Rom 8:29 οὗς προέγνω);⁹ as well as the eighty (80) longer clauses which have the verb immediately after the relative (e.g. Phm 10 ὃν ἐγέννησα ἐν

⁹Rom 1:27; 4:17, 21; 5:26; 6:16b; 7:6, 15b, 15c; 7:19a; 8:29, 30b; 9:18a; 10:8; 11:2; 14:22a, 22b; I Cor 3:5, 14; 4:6; 7:1, 20, 24, 36, 39; 10:13b, 15, 16a, 16b, 20; 11:23b, 26; 15:10, 37; II Cor 1:17; 2:10b; 11:12b, 17; 12:21; Gal 1:9; 2:18; 3:19b; Phl 3:16; 4:11; Phm 21.

τοῖς δεσμοῖς).¹⁰ To these 124 relative clauses are added the thirteen (13) in which the intervening particle has been shown to be part of the relative construction¹¹ and the seventeen (17) in which only a post-positive connective comes between relative and verb (e.g. Rom 2:1 ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίνεται...¹²

Moreover, in the Homologoumena, whenever καί or οὐ follow the relative immediately and are not used as connectives (καί... καί..., οὐ... ἀλλὰ...), these two particles go with and are part of the constituent which follows the particle. In such a position καί is always additive in force, i.e. 'also', and it emphasizes the constituent of which it is a part. Οὐ(κ) not only negates the constituent which follows, i.e. much like the ἀ-privative, but it also emphasizes that constituent by contrast. Thus fifteen of the relative clauses with the pattern +r +καί +v ±...(e.g. I Cor 1:8 ὅς καί βεβαιώσεται ...) and another fifteen in which

¹⁰ Rom 1:2, 5, 6, 9, 25a, 25b; 2:6; 15, 16; 3:25, 30; 4:16, 24, 25; 5:14; 6:2, 16a, 17; 8:3, 15, 34a; 9:4a, 23; 11:7; 12:3; 16:5b, 7a; I Cor 1:9, 30; 2:7; 3:11, 17; 4:17a; 6:5, 19; 7:13; 12:23; 14:37; 15:1a, 25, 31, 36; II Cor 1:4, 10b, 13; 2:3, 4; 4:4b, 6; 5:10; 7:7; 8:22; 9:11; 10:2, 8, 13; 12:6, 13, 17; Gal 1:8; 2:2, 4a, 4b; 3:16, 19a; 4:19b, 24a, 24b, 26; 5:19, 21; Phil 1:28; 2:8, 15; 3:7, 21; I Th 1:10; 3:9; Phm 5, 10, 12.

¹¹ ^αΟς μέν Rom 14:2, 5a; I Cor 10:21a; 12:28.
^βΟς δέ Rom 14:5b; I Cor 10:21b. ^γΟς ἐάν I Cor 6:18; 16:2, 3; Gal 5:10, 17; 6:7. ^δΟς ἄν I Cor 11:27.

¹² Γὰρ Rom 2:1; 6:10a; 7:15a; 8:24. (Cf. also Rom 14:5a; Gal 6:7). Δέ Rom 6:10b; 8:30a, 30c; 9:18b; I Cor 7:37; II Cor 11:12a; Gal 1:20. (Cf. also II Cor 2:10a; Gal 2:20.) Καί as correlative connective-- I Cor 4:5; Phil 4:9. Καί as correlative connective-- II Cor 5:4.

the pattern is +r +oú +v ±... (e.g. Rom 7:16 ὁ οὐ θέλω)¹³ actually have the verb in the second position. In another twenty (20) cases the verb is separated from the relative only by constituents that either regularly begin clauses or else regularly occur immediately before the verb.¹⁴

Although the ratio of relative clauses with the verb in the second position to the total number of relative clauses varies considerably according to verb type,¹⁵

¹³ Καὶ Rom 8:34b; 9:24; I Cor 1:8; 2:13; 11:23a; 15:1b, 1c, 1d, 3; II Cor 3:6; Gal 2:10; Phl 3:12; 4:9, 10; I Th 2:13; 5:24. This includes all the relative clauses with the additive particle immediately after the relative except Rom 5:2a; 16:7b; II Cor 1:6; Phl 3:20.

All the relative clauses in which οὐ follows the relative immediately have the verb immediately after the negative: Rom 7:16; 19b, 20; 8:25; 10:14a, 14b; 15:18; I Cor 4:7; 10:13a; 15:9, 15; II Cor 11:4a, 4b, 4c; Gal 1:7.

¹⁴ Thus the verb comes immediately after οὖν (Rom 6:21; Gal 2:20), ποτε (Gal 1:23), πολλάκις (Phl 3:18), πάλιν (Gal 4:19), and perhaps by analogy πολλά (Rom 16:6, 12). For fuller discussion see III-214-216.

Nominative forms of personal pronouns before verb: ἐγώ (Rom 16:4b; I Cor 10:30; Phm 13); ἡμεῖς (Rom 16:17; II Cor 1:6). For fuller discussion see III-216-218. Oblique forms of the personal pronouns usually are immediately adjacent to the verb, usually following, but occasionally before. Exx. of pronoun before: ὑμῶν (Rom 16:2); ὑμᾶς (I Cor 4:17b); ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (II Cor 9:2); εἰς ὑμᾶς (II Cor 13:3). For fuller discussion see III-218-220.

Absolute pronouns usually precede verb: πάντες (Rom 5:12); τὰ πάντα (Phl 3:8); οὐδέ τις (I Cor 2:8) and perhaps by analogy οἱ πλείονες (I Cor 15:6). For a fuller discussion see III, pp. 217-218.

¹⁵ Transitive, di-transitive, modal and especially equative and copula clauses are proportionately higher than the overall ratio. For example Gal 4:9 (οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεῦσαι θέλετε) is the only modal clause in which the modal does not immediately follow the relative (Phm 13 ὃν ἐγὼ ἐβουλόμην only appears to be an exception).

All the equative clauses have the verb immediately after the relative and only four of the attributive clauses

204 out of 238 is a very high proportion. Given the usual Greek tendency to put the verb last, this characteristic of Pauline relative clauses is most striking.¹⁶

Connective and Modal Particles in all cases follow the relative immediately and most are either part of the relative construction or are related to the constituent which immediately follows the particle. The preceding chapter demonstrated that ἔτι, αὖ, γε, μέν and δέ (when this last particle is preceded by an equivalent construction with μέν) are a part of the relative and affect its meaning. As such they function like suffixes attached to the relative.¹⁷ The postpositive connectives: γάρ and δέ, may follow the relative immediately, if the relative clause introduces the head construction; in such cases these connectives are not

do not (Rom 3:8; 16:7; II Cor 2:9; 11:15).

On the other hand the intransitive clauses seldom have the verb in the second position, unless the clause has only r and PRD. In these clauses ACT precedes PRD invariably, even when ACT is represented by a long noun phrase. This is our first evidence that constituent order may be affected by verb type.

¹⁶Eduard Norden, pp 257, 365-6, noted this frequently and called it the most common Semetism in the New Testament, after the paralleling of clauses. The same phenomenon is also noted by Frisk (pp. 28, 131-4), Turner (pp. 347-8), Matthew Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1967), pp. 50-51, and Eduard Schwyzer, Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik. Vol II of Griechische Grammatik. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Walter Otto, ed. (München, 1959), p. 695. But no set of statistics produced elsewhere has indicated how truly frequent one finds this characteristic.

¹⁷Cf. Chapter II, pp. 144-151.

a constituent of the relative clause.¹⁸

Kai follows the relative immediately in twenty-three clauses and in each it serves an additive function, emphasizing and going with the constituent which follows it.¹⁹ *Oû(κ)* is a negative particle that is found sixteen times immediately after the relative. In all but one it negates, goes with, and emphasizes the constituent which follows it immediately, usually the predicate.²⁰ *Oûdê*, which usually comes at the beginning of its clause and emphasizes and negates the following constituent, does exactly that in Galatians 2:5 (*οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν ἐξέσμεν* ●.).

Transitional Temporal Particles, so-called because because they often relate (by parallel or contrast) successive

¹⁸*καὶ* Rom 2:1; 6:10; 7:15; 8:24; 14:5; I Cor 12:8; Gal 6:7. It is found in as similar position in six clauses: Rom 2:12; 8:14; 15:4; II Cor 1:20; Gal 3:10, 27. The fact that in each case the relative clause precedes the head clauses indicates that the particle belongs to the whole sentence and not to the relative clause alone.

Δέ Rom 6:10b; 8:30a, 30c; 9:16b; I Cor 7:37; II Cor 2:10; 11:12, 21; Gal 2:10. The placing of *δέ* in the three relative clauses of Rom 8:30 (*οὓς δέ... καὶ οὓς... οὓς δέ...*), in Rom 14:23 (*πάν δὲ ὁ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως*), and in I Cor 7:1 (*περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράφετε*) demonstrates both the post-positive and the simple connective character of the particle.

¹⁹For evidence of this point see Chapter II, pp. 144-146.

²⁰Rom 7:16, 19b, 20; 8:25; 10:14a, 14b; 15:18; I Cor 4:7; 10:13a; 15:9, 15; II Cor 11:4a, 4b, 4c; Gal 1:7.

clauses, tend to follow the relative immediately.²¹ In the relative clauses of the Homologoumena such particles include $\nu\upsilon\nu$, $\omicron\upsilon\nu$, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu$, $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\varsigma$ and $\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon$. An examination of the use of these particles in both relative and other clauses of the Homologoumena demonstrates that: (1) $\nu\upsilon\nu$ ²² and $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\varsigma$ ²³ usually occur as early as possible in clauses, (2) $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu$ ²⁴

²¹F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature, Tr. and Rev. by Robert W. Funk (Chicago, 1961), paragraph 472, 1 and K.J. Dover, Greek Word Order (Cambridge, 1960), p. 21 assert that such particles usually come early in Greek sentences.

²² $\nu\upsilon\nu$ --occurs in the Homologoumena thirty-two times. It often occurs at the beginning of a clause, sometimes as $\nu\upsilon\nu$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$... (Rom 11:30; I Cor 7:14; 12:18, 20; 14:6; Gal 4:9; Phil 3:18; Phm 9) reminiscent of $\nu\upsilon\nu$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$... which the texts often substitute, and at other times as the first word after the connective. (Rom 6:19; I Cor 16:12; II Cor 6:2; Gal 2:20; 4:29; Phil 1:20, 30; 2:12; I Th 3:8). It always comes near the beginning of the clause as possible, except when it follows an introductory temporal participle (Rom 5:9; 16:26; II Cor 13:2) or is placed elsewhere for emphasis (in Rom 11:31 (2x) and Gal 1:23 the placing of the $\nu\upsilon\nu$ is obviously for emphasis--a parallel in the former and a $\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\nu\upsilon\nu$ contrast in the latter). $\nu\upsilon\nu$ stands between the relative and the undergoer in Romans 5:11 and between the relative and the verb in Romans 6:21 and Galatians 2:20.

²³ $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\varsigma$ occurs eight times. In four (Rom 1:13; II Cor 8:22; Phil 3:18) it introduces the clause construction in which it occurs and four times in Paul's discussion of his ministry (II Corinthians 11:23-23) it occurs after a dative specifying a class of threats (Dover, op. cit., p. 21) notes that $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\varsigma$ tends to come at the beginning of Greek clauses.

²⁴ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu$ is not found in the Antilegomena but occurs twenty-eight times in the accepted epistles. It is never final in its clause, except perhaps I Cor 13:2. It usually precedes the word with which it goes, often a verbal form (Rom 11:23; II Cor 11:16; 12:21; Gal 1:9, 17; 2:1; Phil 4:4), or introducing successive parallel clauses or quotations (Rom 15:10, 11, 12; I Cor 3:20; 7:5; 12:21; II Cor 1:16). It is frequently early in its clause. However, no clear pattern emerges which is descriptive for a large majority of the Pauline examples.

often comes early in its clause, but is more likely to precede the word or clause with which it goes, and (3) ποτε²⁵ usually is second or third in its clauses, although it may occur much later. In the relative clauses of the Homologoumena these transitional temporal particles regularly stand immediately after the relative.²⁶

Nominative Pronouns, especially the nominative forms of the personal pronouns (i.e. ἐγώ, ἡμεῖς, σύ, ὑμεῖς), regularly introduce the sentences in which they are employed.²⁷

²⁵ Ποτέ has a distribution much like πάλιν with two exceptions: (1) it never begins a clause, and (2) it may stand final (Rom 7:9; I Cor 9:7; Gal 1:23). Although it may occur later in a clause it has a tendency to occur in the second or third positions (Rom 1:10; Gal 1:23; 2:6; Phl 4:10; I Th 2:5). It is second in the relative clauses in Galatians 1:23; 2:6.

²⁶ Νῦν Rom 5:11; 6:21; Gal 2:20. Πολλάκις Phl 3:18. Πάλιν Gal 4:19a. Ποτέ Gal 1:23. Clearly οὖν with ὅσος in Rom 11:13 (ἐφ' ὅσον μὲν οὖν εἰμὶ...) and in Phl 3:15 (ὅσοι οὖν τέλειοι) and perhaps πολλάκις with ἥτις in Rom 16:6, 12 are analogies to this.

This examination of raises an important question about constituent order in Paul. Does Paul frequently begin clauses with temporal constructions? Blass-Debrunner and Kuhner-Gerth (Bl-D, para. 472, 1; K-G, p. 595) would argue positively for classical and New Testament Greek in general. The early πρὸ ἐμοῦ in Romans 16:7b, οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν in Galatians 2:5, would seem to support this contention. On the other hand, the presence of similar phrases later in Pauline relative clauses to show time (Cf. e.g. I Cor 1:8; 2:7; II Cor 1:10b; Gal 2:5; Eph 4:16; Col 2:19; II Tim 1:3; just to name a few) and the obvious emphasis in Galatians 2:5, emphasizes which might explain the prior position, prevents our making a firm decision.

²⁷ Εἰ comes as early in its clause as possible, usually first, in the Pauline sentences in which it occurs by a ratio of over six to one. Furthermore, most of the passages in which it comes later are examples of stylized constructions. For example, οὐκ and negatives are very early in Pauline sentences--Rom 7:17, 20b; Gal 2:20. By habit Paul begins sentences containing a form of ἀσπάζομαι

In the relative clauses they are almost always found between the relative and the verb.²⁸ Since Greek verbs have personal suffixes, the nominative pronoun can be, and usually is, unexpressed. A careful examination of all of the examples in the Homologoumena confirms that it is expressed only for emphasis.

With regularity, πάντες (also perhaps the other nominative forms of πᾶς) and οὐδεὶς, the universal pronouns,

with that verb--Rom 16:22. Contrasting elements are often drawn together--Rom 9:3; 15:14; I Cor 4:15. Forms of εἶναι almost invariably occur in the second position--Rom 9:3; 11:13.

Ἡμεῖς begins forty-nine of the fifty-two clauses in which it occurs. In two of the remaining (Rom 15:1; II Cor 9:4) it follows a verb with imperatival force. (Such verbs usually introduce the clause in which they appear).

Σὺ introduces all sixteen clauses in which it appears in the Homologoumena. The five examples of prolepsis with (Rom 9:20 οὐ τίς ἐστὶ δὲ ἀνταποκρινόμενος τῷ θεῷ; 14:4, 10a, 10b; I Cor 15:36) confine the assumption that the nominative personal pronoun is included only for emphasis.

Ὑμεῖς also introduces the clauses in which it appears by a ratio of four to one. In the few exceptions it occurs immediately before or immediately after the verb. As with the other nominative forms it is expressed only the person(s) is emphasized (e.g. cf. Rom 6:17; 8:9; I Cor 3:30; 4:10a, 10b, 10c; 5:2; 6:8; 12:27; 16:2, passages in which the emphasis is based on contrasts; Or, cf. Rom 6:11; 7:4; 11:30; I Cor 14:9, 12; 16:1, 16, passages in which the emphasis grows out of parallelism.

²⁸The nominative of the personal pronoun is in the second position in the following cases: Ἐγώ - Rom 16:4; I Cor 10:30; Phm 13. Ἡμεῖς - Rom 16:17; II Cor 1:6. A proleptic σὺ is found in I Cor 15:36 (οὐ δὲ σπέρεις). Ὑμεῖς is second in Rom 16:17 but it follows forms of εἶναι in Rom 1:6 and I Cor 3:17. As noted above forms of εἶναι are almost always in the second position.

come as early as possible in their clauses.²⁹ As a result πάντες is found between the relative and the verb in Romans 5:12 (ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον) and οὐδεὶς in that position in I Corinthians 2:8 (ἣν οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἔγνωνεν...).³⁰

The Oblique Cases of Personal Pronouns, with or without prepositional connectives, regularly occur immediately adjacent to (usually after) the verb, whenever such pronominal constructions function as constituents of the clause. This is the most consistent violation of Behaghel's Law in the Pauline relative clauses and one of the more striking

²⁹ Πάντες--is found fifty-three times in the corpus, forty-four cases of which are located in the Homologoumena. In the authentic letters it occurs as early as possible in thirty-two cases. In three examples it occurs in the predicative position at the end of an introductory noun phrase (I Cor 9:24; 10:1; Gal 1:2. Similar constructions are found in I Cor 16:20; 13:12; Phl 4:22; but in these cases the construction is at the end of the clause,) and in three cases it immediately follows an emphasized introductory phrase (I Cor 12:13a; 15:22a; 22b). The observations made above about ἀπαύξωμα and ὑμᾶς would lead us to expect the πάντες construction at the end of I Cor 16:20; II Cor 13:12; and Phl 4:22.

Οὐδεὶς--is in meaning the exact opposite of πάντες, but its distribution is almost identical. It occurs in all forms forty times in the Homologoumena. In no case is it final in the clause and in twenty-five instances it comes first. On only one occasion does the nominative follow the predicate (I Cor 6:5), a situation to be expected with a form of οὐδεὶς.

³⁰ Paul's penchant for putting the nominative of οὐδεὶς at the beginning of a clause would explain the infraction of Behaghel's law at this point. The long genitive construction following οὐδεὶς in I Cor 2:8 is descriptive of οὐδεὶς.

peculiarities of the entire corpus.³¹ Neither the presence or absence of prepositional connective nor the class of the verb affect this circumstance.

³¹Behaghel's law, i.e. that shorter units come earlier in Greek clauses, would lead us to conclude that enclitics, e.g. certain conjunctions such as τε, γε, κα, copulatives such as εἰμί, ἐστί, ἐσμεν, ἐστέ εἰσὶ and pronouns such as τις the oblique forms of ἐγώ and σύ would come as early after the first word (they are postpositives generally) as possible. Schwyzer (p. 690) and Dover (pp. 11-14) are two of the more recent scholars to note that this is the tendency of Greek generally.

The position of the oblique cases of the pronominal forms in the Pauline corpus stands in marked contrast to this regular Greek practice. In almost ninety percent of all the phrases in which the corpus used either the enclitics μοι, με, σοι and σε or the pronominal forms ἡμῖν, ἡμᾶς, ὑμῖν and ὑμᾶς the pronoun comes either immediately before or immediately after the predicate. (This figure included all the prepositional phrases containing the dative and accusative of either the first or second person personal pronouns. More significantly the ten percent includes all examples of the pronouns away from the verb, including substantivized prepositional phrases and the pronouns in noun phrases. It also includes the pronouns in clauses without an expressed verb.) By a ratio of almost four to one these pronouns follow the predicate immediately in the corpus.

The chart below will both document the proportions above and will show the variations in the usage of the different forms. Figures for the whole corpus are included because there is apparently no regular variation.

TABLE VIII

POSITION OF OBLIQUE PERSONAL PRONOUNS

	WITHOUT PREPOSITIONS			IN PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES		
	Imm. bef verb	Imm. aft verb	Away from verb	Imm. bef verb	Imm. aft verb	Away from verb
ἐμοί	4	3	11	4	3	8
μοι	29	18	9	--	--	--
ἐμέ	1	1	3	2	1	6
με	26	12	1	22	1	2
ἡμῖν	18	2	1	5	2	3
ἡμᾶς	49	12	4	2	1	9
σοι	9	2	3	1	--	3
σε	14	4	1	1	--	3
ὑμῖν	65	21	17	31	11	16
ὑμᾶς	120	27	7	41	7	35

The personal pronoun in the genitive, dative or accusative cases follows the verb of the relative clause almost invariably. (e.g. Rom 9:24 οὗς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς... and I Cor 13:10 ἢν ὁ κύριος ἔδωκέν μοι εἰς οἰκοδομήν...).32

Consistency and Variation. Table IX on the following page shows in visual form both the effect of Behaghel's Law and the statistics on those constructions which have a predilection for a particular place in the clause. It makes clear the consistency of the patterns heretofore discussed. It also demonstrates that the exceptions to the patterns are proportionately spread throughout the Homologoumena.

3. Clause Type and Constituent Order

The clause type, a matter directly related to the nature of the verb, is a third factor which significantly affects the order of nuclear constituents in Pauline relative clauses.³³ Although earlier studies failed to distinguish

³²Oblique personal pronouns not in prepositional phrases: Rom 9:24; I Cor 1:8; 10:13; 11:23; 14:37; 15:1; II Cor 1:10a; 2:3; 3:6; 10:13; 12:6; 13:10; Gal 1:8, 20; 5:21; Phl 1:28; 3:7, 18; Phm 12. In prepositional phrases: Rom 8:34; 16:6; II Cor 7:7; 9:11; 12:6, 17; 13:3a, 3b; Phl 4:9; I Th 3:9. The three exceptions, i.e. Rom 16:6 (οὗ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν...); I Cor 4:17 (ὅς ὑμᾶς ἀναμνησεί...); II Cor 2:4 (ἢν ἔχω περισσοτέρως εἰς ὑμᾶς); 13:3 (ὅς εἰς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἀσθενεῖ...), are all the result of the emphasizing of the pronoun.

³³That clause type affects the order of nuclear constituents is an important distinction. The order of most other constituents is usually determined by Behaghel's Law. It is the nuclear constituents that earlier studies have examined and been able to determine no regular order of appearance.

TABLE IX
CONSTITUENT PATTERNS

	Total Rel Cl	Breaks Behagel	Verb Position				Particles			Pronouns						Emphasis	
			No Vb	Second	Early as Possible	2 Member Clause	Derivs	Later	Pre-Vb	Non-Verb	Absolute Pre-Vb	Absolute Past-Vb	Nomin Pre-Vb	Nomin Past-Vb	Oblique Pre-Vb		Oblique Past-Vb
Rom	91	10	8	43	71	31	7		2	2	1		3	1	1	3	13
I Cor	62	8	3	32	56	25	4		7		2		2	1	1	5	8
II Cor	44	9	3	22	29	11	3	1	1	1						12	9
Gal	30	6	1	15	25	4	1		1							3	6
Eph	19	4	4	7	11	3			2	1	1					4	3
I Th	4			2	4	1			2							1	
Phm	5	1		4	5	1							1			1	1
II Th	13	2		7	10	3		1	3							4	2
Col	41	2		29	40	5	1		5	1	1	3	2	2		5	
Eph	37	6	1	23	29	2	1	1	1	3	4		3			3	6
I Tm	25	5	1	14	14	2					1			3		1	5
II Tm	23	1	3	13	15	4				2			1	1	1	5	4
Tit	10	1		8	8	1								2			1

clause types, a weakness that makes even the most careful study difficult to interpret or use,³⁴ a systematic analysis of the relative clauses leads to the firm conclusion that there are six types of relative clauses in the Homologoumena. They are transitive, di-transitive, modal, intransitive, equative, and attributive. Each is structurally distinguishable and each has a very regular nuclear constituent order.³⁵

Transitive Clauses are those relative clauses in which the predicate is manifested by a transitive verb.

³⁴E.g. Frisk (op. cit., p. 28) found in many Greek authors more clauses containing subjects and predicates than sentences containing predicates and objects. Furthermore, he limits objects to accusative objects. Also he includes clauses with forms of *εἶναι* in his statistics, at least on subject-predicate counts. There is no way of determining from his apparently careful analysis why he chose to exclude dative and genitive objects; do clauses containing such objects constitute a distinguishable type? Nor can one determine the order of constituents when both subject and object are present in the same clause. Or, does the great variation in the ratio of object-predicate to predicate-object clauses between independent and relative clauses in most authors stem from the frequency of relatives used as object accusatives? Does the function of the relative have anything to do with clause order? These and many other questions equally essential cannot be answered from the statistics from Frisk.

³⁵Because the discovery of relationship between clause type and constituent order is one of the more important by-products of this study, and also because most earlier studies have been concerned only with nuclear constituents and yet have denied the existence of any significant word orders (cf. the history of such efforts in Frisk, pp. 5-12, and Loepfe, pp. 1-22), a detailed argument justifying this new conclusion must be made.

Excursus III, pp. 278-303, examines all of the evidence in the Pauline relative clauses.

Although no Pauline example has more than four nuclear constituents, careful examination shows that the five possible are regularly arranged in the following order:

=>r +PRD:vt +BEN:prn +ACT +UND (+BEN:pph).³⁶

Among the 145 examples of this clause type in the Homologoumena are

Romans 2:16

ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρα / κρίνει / ὁ θεὸς / τὰ κρυπτὰ
τῶν ἀνθρώπων

+CON:r +PRD:vt +ACT:nph +UND:nph

II Corinthians 10:13

οὐδ' / ἐμέρισεν / ἡμῖν / ὁ θεός...

+UND:r +PRD:vt +BEN:prn +ACT:nph

All of the variations from this order are to be explained by the influence of Behaghel's Law,³⁷ construction type,³⁸ or emphasis.³⁹

Di-transitive Clauses are clauses in which the verb demands a role or attribute constituent for completion in addition to the undergoer constituent. Although no Pauline di-transitive clause has more than four, the

³⁶The detailed argument for this order is found in Excursus III, pp. 280-286.

³⁷E.g. II Cor 2:4 ἦν ἔχω περισσοτέρως εἰς ὑμᾶς.

³⁸E.g. Rom 16:17 ἦν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε I Cor 2:8; I Cor 1:6; Phl 3:8.

³⁹E.g. Rom 4:6 ὃ ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται ... (Cf. argument on pp. III, 230-235). Also Rom 5:2a, 11; 8:32; II Cor 4:4; 13:10(?).

regular pattern for the six possible nuclear constituents is clearly:

+r +PRD:vd +BEN +ACT +UND +ROL/ATT.⁴⁰

Typical examples of the regular order of these eleven clauses are found in:

Romans 6:16a

ὧ / παριστάνετε / ἑαυτοὺς / δούλους...,

+BEN:r +PRD:vd +UND:prn +ROL:n

Philippians 3:21

ὁς / μετασχηματίσει / τὸ σῶμα... / σύμμορφων... .

+ACT:r +PRD:vd +UND:nph +ATT:adjph

Again the only variations in that order are the results of Behaghel's Law,⁴¹ construction type,⁴² or emphasis.⁴³

Modal Clauses are those relative clauses in which the verb requires or assumes an infinitival construction for completion. Such clauses manifest great regularity in constituent order, not only in nuclear constituents of the relative clause, but also in the nuclear constituents of the infinitival phrase which manifest the predicate.

⁴⁰The detailed argument justifying the distinguishing of di-transitive clauses from transitive clauses as well as providing an analysis of all of the Pauline examples of this clause type (with clause maps) is found in Excursus III, pp. 286-289.

⁴¹I Cor 12:28 οὗς μὲν ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρῶτον ἀποστόλους... .

⁴²I Cor 4:17b ὁς ὑμᾶς ἀναμνήσει τοὺς ὁδοὺς μου.

⁴³Phl 2:6(?)ὁς...οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι.

The regular arrangement of the twenty-three Pauline modal clauses is:

+r +MOD:vm +ACT +PRD:infph.⁴⁴

Typical examples of this order are to be found in

II Corinthians 2:3

ἀφ' ὧν / ἔδει / με χαίρειν

+SOU:r +MOD:vm +PRD:infph

Galatians 2:10

ὁ / καὶ ἐσπούδασα / αὐτο τοῦτο ποιῆσαι

+UND:r +MOD:vm +PRD:infph = (UND:prn PRD:inf)

Philemon 13

ὦν / ἐγὼ / ἐβουλόμην / πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν κατέχειν

+UND:r +ACT:prn +MOD:vm +PRD:infph.

As these examples show, the infinitive usually follows the nuclear constituents of its phrase, and often the non-nuclear constituents as well (e.g. Phm 13, Gal 4:9).

All the variations in either the order of the modal clauses or in the infinitival phrase are due to either Behaghel's Law,⁴⁵ construction type,⁴⁶ or emphasis.⁴⁷

Intransitive Clauses are relative clauses in which the predicate cannot (under normal circumstances) receive a

⁴⁴Cf. Excursus III, pp. 289-292. for extended discussion of the Pauline modal clauses.

⁴⁵I Cor 6:5 ὅς δυνήσεται διακρίναι ..., II Cor 10:2.

⁴⁶Phm 13 ὦν ἐγὼ ἐβουλόμην ..., Gal 2:10; 5:17.

⁴⁷Gal 4:9 οἷς / .πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεῦσαι / θέλετε.

complement and for which there is no passive clause transformation. These clauses, of which the Homologoumena contains twenty-nine examples, may have four nuclear constituents in the following order:

+r +ACT +PRD:vi +BEN.⁴⁸

This order can be seen clearly in:

Romans 8:34b

ὁς / καὶ ἐντυγχάνει / ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν

+ACT:r +PRD:vi +BEN:pph

Romans 14:21

ἐν ᾧ / ὁ ἀδελφός σου / προσκίπτει

+CAU:r +ACT:nph +PRD:vi

The consistency with which this order is found is made even more remarkable by the realizations that (1) the comparative positions of ACT and PRD vary markedly from the constituent patterns of every other clause type, and (2) this variation often necessitates the fracturing of Behaghel's Law.⁴⁹ The constituent order of the transitive clauses is unusually constant; however, emphasis does occasionally move a non-nuclear constituent to an earlier position.⁵⁰

⁴⁸That transitive and intransitive clauses are significantly different, at least in the presence or absence of UND, has long been recognized. For the argument which establishes the regular order of Pauline intransitive relative clauses, see Excursus III, pp. 292-295.

⁴⁹Rom 14:21 above. Cf. also I Cor 10:11; 15:6.

⁵⁰Rom 2:23 ὁς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶται; II Cor 13:3.

Equative Clauses are relative clauses containing a copular verb (roughly equivalent in meaning to "equal") and an identifier constituent manifested by a noun or noun-phrase. The regular constituent pattern for these twenty-one Pauline equative clauses is

+r +SBJ +EQU:vcp +IDN:n/nph.⁵¹

This order can be seen clearly in:

Romans 9:4

οἵτινές / εἰσιν / Ἰσραηλῖται

Galatians 4:26

ἡτις / ἐστὶν / μήτηρ ἡμῶν.

The regularity of the pattern and of the equative clauses themselves is made more obvious by several facts. In all but six of the clauses SBJ is manifested by r.⁵² EQU is expressed in all but four of the clauses.⁵³ In most of the clauses IDN is manifested by a noun phrase.⁵⁴

Attributival Clauses contain a copular verb and predicate some attribute about a subject. There are thirty Pauline examples and they may contain as many as four nuclear constituents arranged in the following order:

+r +COP:vcp +SBJ +ATT:adj/adjph/pph.⁵⁵

⁵¹The distinguishing of equative and attributival clauses is justified in Excursus III, pp. 298-299.

⁵²I Cor 15:10; II Cor 2:16a, 16b; Gal 5:10; Phl 3:19a, 19b.

⁵³II Cor 2:16a, 16b; Phl 3:19a, 19b.

⁵⁴I Cor 15:10, II Cor 2:16a, 16b; Gal 5:10.

⁵⁵The attributival clause maps are discussed in detail in Excursus III, pp. 301-303.

Among the Pauline examples of this clause type are:

Romans 1:6

ἐν οἷς / ἐστε / καὶ ὑμᾶς / κλητοί...

+LOC:r +COP:vcp +SBJ:prn +ATT:nph

II Corinthians 11:15

ὥν τὸ τέλος / ἔσται / κατὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν

+SBJ:nph = (+POS:r +SBJ:nph) +COP:vcp +ATT(CMP):pph

Attributival clauses vary much more than equative clauses or, for that matter, than do most other types of clauses. COP is omitted in more than half of the Pauline examples. SBJ is present in most, but in only one-half of the cases is it manifested by r. Only ATT is present in all the clauses, but it is manifested by a great variety of construction types.

In spite of the wide variety in the clauses only emphasis⁵⁶ and sense (the practice of putting possessives and possessed together)⁵⁷ have an undisputed effect upon the regular order.

The Distribution of the Clause Types throughout the Pauline Corpus is shown on Table X on the pages which follow. The evidence for the particulars of this distribution is found in tables of Excursus III, in which all of the relative clauses of the Corpus are classified according to clause type and internal complexity.

⁵⁶Rom 16:7; II Cor 2:9 ἢ εἰς πάντα ὑπῆκοοι ἐστε.

⁵⁷E.g. Rom 3:8 ὥν τὸ κρίμα.

TABLE X
DISTRIBUTION OF CLAUSE TYPES

	Transitive	Df- Transitive	Modal	In- Transitive	Equative	Attributive
Rom	52	4	10	12	4	14
I Cor	34	3	6	9	5	6
II Cor	30	1	3	3	3	4
Gal	16		3	1	5	3
Phl	6	3		3	4	3
I Th	3			1		
Phm	4		1			
II Th	8	1		2	1	1
Col	20		1	3	12	5
Eph	21		2	5	8	1
I Tm	12	2	1	4	2	4
II Tm	12	1		3		7
Tit	7	1	2			

These tables show that all six types of relative clauses are found in most of the Homologoumena except I Thessalonians and Philemon, epistles with four and five relative clauses respectively. In general the tables show a consistent proportion of each clause type in the different epistles. Although it is difficult to know what to make of it, it is obvious that variations in proportions increase as the epistles become progressively shorter. Of the epistles having enough relative clauses for comparison, Philippians shows the greatest variation with a smaller proportion of transitive clauses and a larger proportion of di-transitive, equative and attributival clauses than the other epistles. Both Galatians and Philippians have slightly more equative clauses than attributival clauses.

It should also be noted that the Pauline relative clauses of all types are generally short and uncomplicated. More than half contain no non-nuclear constituent, and those that do seldom contain more than two or three. The more complex relative clauses in the Homologoumena seem to be the result of the compounding of particular constituents, rather than extended successive subordination.

4. Emphasis

The detailed order of constituents, both nuclear and non-nuclear, in 227/259 Pauline relative clauses is explained by the simple application of the three principles already discussed in this chapter. Emphasis (and perhaps

the effect of traditional formulations in a few cases) explain the variations in the remaining thirty-two.

The variations in the constituent order in the relative clauses manifest two patterns: (1) moving a particular constituent to the second place (i.e. immediately after the relative) or else (2) moving a particular nuclear constituent to the last place in the clause.⁵⁸ All of the examples of the latter are explained by Behaghel's Law.⁵⁹ Thus, in the relative clauses of the Homologoumena there are no clear examples of emphasis on the final constituent.

Either a nuclear or a non-nuclear constituent may, for emphasis, be moved to the position immediately after the relative.⁶⁰ An examination of examples of each will serve

⁵⁸ Usually both the moving of a particular constituent to the beginning of its clause and the moving of another constituent to the end of its clause has been regarded as the result of emphasis. As is noted below, there is no evidence of emphasis on the final constituent in any of the Pauline relative clauses. In spite of Dover's warnings on the problems of using emphasis as a category, there appears to be good evidence on the emphasis of the second position in the Pauline relative clauses. K. J. Dover, Greek Word Order (Cambridge, 1960), pp. 32-34.

⁵⁹ I Cor 1:8; 10:13a; 12:28; II Cor 2:4; 8:22; 9:2; Gal 5:31. Cf. pp. III, 208f. above.

⁶⁰ Among the examples of emphasized nuclear constituents are:
ACT: Rom 4:6 (ὁ θεός); I Cor 2:8 (οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀρχόντων...);
II Cor 4:4a (ὁ θεός τοῦ αἰῶνος.); 13:10 (ὁ κύριος).

BEN: Rom 16:4a (ὕπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου);
II Cor 9:2 (ὕπὲρ ἡμῶν); Gal 6:14 (ἐμὸν).

to demonstrate this principle.

The initial key to explaining this phenomenon is found in the relative positions of the nominative forms of the personal pronouns and of indefinite pronouns.⁶¹

UND: Rom 1:32(αὐτά); 5:2a (καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν), 11 (τὴν καταλλαγὴν); 8:32 (τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ); 16:4a (τὴν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον); 6 (πολλά); 12 (πολλά); I Cor 4:17b (ὕμᾱς); II Cor 8:10 (compound infph); Gal 6:14 (κόσμος); Phl 2:20 (τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν); 3:20 (καὶ σωτῆρα).

IDN: Phl 2:6 (ἀρπαγμόν).

ATT: Rom 3:8 (ἔνδικον); II Cor 2:9 (ὑπήκοοι).

SBJ: Rom 3:8 (ὣν τὸ κρίμα); II Cor 11:15 (ὣν τὸ τέλος).
Among the examples of emphasized non-nuclear constituents are:

CNC: Rom 1:32 (long ptchr); 4:18 (παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι); II Cor 10:1 (ἀπῶν); Phl 2:6 (? long ptchr).

TEM: Rom 16:7b (καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ); II Cor 10:1 (κατὰ πρόσωπον); Gal 2:5 (οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν); 4:9 (πάλιν ἀνῶθεν).

LOC: II Cor 3:14 (ἐν Χριστῷ); 13:3 (εἰς γῆρα); Phl 4:3 (ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ).

CAU: Rom 2:23 (ἐν νόμῳ).

INS: Gal 5:4 (ἐν νόμῳ).

SOU: II Cor 1:10a (ἐκ τηλικούτου θανάτου).

AGT: I Cor 12:8 (διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος).

MAN: Phl 2:20 (γυνήσως).

N.B. some relative clauses are listed more than once in this and/or the first part of this footnote. In such cases more than one constituent precedes the predicate or copular. Usually two constituents before the verb are both emphasized by a contrast between them (cf. e.g. Rom 4:18; Gal 6:14).

⁶¹Cf. pp. III, 216 above.

The former, which are made unnecessary by the inflection of the verb, are used only for emphasis. They precede the predicate almost invariably. Likewise, the pronouns and adjectives which are used to make absolute statements regularly precede the predicate, even when this involves a serious infraction of Behaghel's Law.⁶² On the other hand, ἄνθρωπος and τις when these words mean "someone" or "anyone" regularly follow the predicate.

That the same is true in other cases can be seen, for example, in Romans 4:6: ὃ ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων. In this passage Paul is discussing the contrast between righteousness by faith and righteous by works. The latter, he says, is reckoned according to obligation, while the former is given to those who are justified by faith according to grace. Then to strengthen the argument Paul quotes Psalm 32:1-2, stating that David here speaks of the blessedness of the man to whom God reckons righteousness without works. The emphasis on ὁ θεός in this context is quite clear. Ἐν οἷς ὁ θεός τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτο ἐτύφλωσεν... in II Corinthians 4:4a introduces a new element in a series of theretofore passive statements. This twist adds new drama to Paul's explanation of why the ἄπιστοι, the ἀπολλύμενοι, have not received the gospel. It is not simply

⁶²E.g. I Cor 2:8 (ἣν οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτο ἔγνωκεν ...); II Cor 4:4a (ἐν οἷς / ὁ θεός τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτο / ἐτύφλωσεν / τὰ νοήματα ...).

that their minds have been blinded, but that the god of this aeon has blinded them.⁶³

The difference which emphasis makes in the placing of a non-nuclear constituents can be seen clearly in II Corinthians 13:3; *ὅς εἰς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἀσθενεῖ ἀλλὰ δυνατεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν*. *Εἰς ὑμᾶς* in the first half of the clause contrasts with *ἐν ἐμοί* in the preceding *τοῦ ἐν ἐμοί λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ*. Being thus emphatic because of contrast, *εἰς ὑμᾶς* is placed before the predicate. In the second half of the relative clause there is no contrast between *ἐν ὑμῖν* and *εἰς ὑμᾶς*. Rather *δυνατεῖ* is contrasted by *ἀλλὰ* with *ἀσθενεῖ*, and so it introduces the second half of the clause.⁶⁴ In a similar way *ἐν νόμῳ* precedes the predicate in Romans 2:23 and *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* stands in the same position in II Corinthians 3:14. That emphasis moves the non-nuclear constituent to the second position receives additional confirmation from the force of the adjective in II Corinthians 1:10a: *ὅς ἐκ τηλικούτου θανάτου ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς καὶ ῥύσεται*.

The fact that the additive particle *καί* and the negative particle *οὐ(κ)* invariably come immediately after the

⁶³The contrast between II Cor 10:8 (*ἧς ἔδωκεν ὁ κύριος εἰς οἰκοδομὴν καὶ οὐκ εἰς καθαίρεσιν ὑμῶν*) and II Cor 13:10 (*ἦν ὁ κύριος ἔδωκεν μοι εἰς οἰκοδομὴν καὶ οὐκ εἰς καθαίρεσιν*) provides an ideal illustration of the influence of emphasis on sentence order. The two clauses only the presence of *μοι* and the position of *ὁ κύριος* before the predicate in II Cor 13:10.

⁶⁴A similar set of contrasts is found in Rom 8:32 *ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν*.

relative and that each has been demonstrated to belong to the constituent which follows the particle is both a confirmation of what we have affirmed about emphasis and constituent order, and is at the same time a key to understanding how emphasis works in the Pauline relative clauses.⁶⁵ Usually the added or negated constituent is the predicate, but in a few cases it is either another nuclear constituent or a non-nuclear one.⁶⁶ As the use of these particles shows, emphasis in the Pauline relative clauses is usually the result of parallelism (in which the new element is brought forward and emphasized) or contrast.⁶⁷

5. Traditional Formulations

Is there evidence of the existence of pre-Pauline materials in the relative clauses of the Homologoumena? Does the constituent order of any of the alleged traditional materials support the assertion that they are pre-Pauline? Is there evidence that the style of various types of traditional church material has shaped the constituent order of any of the Pauline relative clauses?

In one sense at least the answer to all of these questions must be positive. The Homologoumena contains

⁶⁵Cf. pp. III, 233-235.

⁶⁶E.g. Rom 5:2a; 16:7b; Phl 3:20.

⁶⁷Cf. e.g. Rom 16:4a where the contrast between τῆς ψυχῆς μου and τὸν ἑαυτὸν τράχηλον brings both to the fore.

fourteen relative clauses in Old Testament quotations. While eight of these manifest normal Pauline constituent orders,⁶⁸ six of them are unusual in some significant way.⁶⁹ In addition, as we shall see below, the form of some of the relative clauses shows the influence of the orders in certain Old Testament passages.

Moreover, it is easy to document, by the use of non-Pauline parallels, the presence of some traditional materials among the relative clauses of the Homologoumena. For example, the doxology: (ὃ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων·ἀμήν.) in Romans 16:27 and Galatians 1:5 is found in exactly the same form in IV Maccabees 18:24, II Timothy 4:18 and Hebrews 13:21.⁷⁰

⁶⁸Rom 9:15a, 15b; 11:4; 15:21a, 21b; I Cor 2:9b, 16.

⁶⁹Rom 3:14--r is POS with ACT. ACT and compound UND (?) precede final PRD.

Rom 4:7a, 7b, 8--r is POS; UND which is qualified by POS:r comes at extreme right.

Rom 10:13--r with πᾶς found only in quotations in the Homologoumena.

I Cor 2:9a--Three PRD at extreme right, each with a negative immediately before it. Each PRD has at least one constituent between it and the relative. Emphasis may explain this arrangement.

Gal 3:10--r with πᾶς found only in quotations in the Homologoumena.

⁷⁰This same form occurs with only slight modifications in Rom 11:36; Eoh 3:21; I Tim 1:17; I Pet 4:11; II Pet 3:18; Jd 25 and Rev 1:6; 5:13. Cf. also similar formulae, often with imperativial form of δόξα in LXX: Josh 7:19; I Sam 6:5; I Chr 16:28-29; II Chr 3:68; 23:33; I Es 5:61; 9:8; Ps 28:1, 2; 67:34; 83:11; 95:7-8; 103:31; 113:9; Wis 10:14; Ma 2:2; Is 20:5; 42:8, 12; Jer 13:16; Bar 2:17, 18; Dan 3:43; 4:32; and Dan Th 3:43.

The form of the doxological relative clauses is quite clear. It usually consists of four parts: (1) the dative (or occasionally the genitive) of the person being glorified; (2) the word of praise, which is usually δόξα (3) a temporal constituent, the so-called "eternity" formula; and (4) a concluding ἀμήν, in most cases.⁷¹

That Paul must have derived these doxologies from his ethos is quite clear, but for our purposes the more important issue is: is there evidence in the form of these clauses which would indicate a non-Pauline authorship? The answer is not unequivocal. The doxologies are attributival clauses, the most varied of the Pauline relative clauses. The benedictions do differ in the following ways: (1) no other attributival clauses have BEN as a constituent; (2) the only other places where the relative is used as ATT in an attributival clause lacking the copula are Romans 9:4-5 and I Corinthians 8:6, both of which may be shaped by traditional formulations;⁷² (3) the presence

⁷¹ Reinhard Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus und Christus-hymnus in der frühen Christenheit* (Göttingen, 1967), p. 25, most recently has developed the basic outline of this form. His arrangement is a three part form, but he does not list the ἀμήν as a separate part.

⁷² In Romans 9:4-5 cf. e.g. Otto Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 12th ed. *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament* (Göttingen, 1963), pp. 223, 227-8. Michel argues that these relative clauses are from Hellenistic-Jewish confessional materials because (1) much of the material is not typically Pauline, (2) there is evidence that Paul has reshaped it, (3) the careful construction of members, and the presence of the Eulogy at the end in v. 5b.

That the eulogy in v. 5b is a tradition eulogy in Jewish form is quite clear. See Deichgräber (p. 42) on

of "Amen."⁷³

A second set of relatives which have clearly been shaped by traditional formulations is I Corinthians 8:6a and 8:6b:

εἰς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ,
 ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν,
 καὶ εἰς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός,
 δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ.

That this is an early two-membered confession or acclamation has long been recognized.⁷⁴ Here the question must be,

this passage as Rom 1:25 and II Cor 11:31.

The relative clauses in Rom 9:4-5 are also different in some ways from the other attributival clauses in the Homologoumena. Nonetheless, because I am unable to discover any traditional parallels for them and because they do not present as many distinctive traits as the other clauses examined in this section, they have been omitted from special consideration.

⁷³Ὁς ἐστὶν εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἁμὴν in Rom 1:25 is clearly a traditional formula. Cf. also Rom 9:5b and II Cor 11:31, as well as Deichgräber, pp. 40-43. These passages share with the doxology in Rom 16:27 (1) the "eternity" formula and (2) the "amen". The order, however, is normal for Paul. For that reason it is not included in this special discussion of the influence of traditional materials on form.

⁷⁴Hans Conzelmann, Der erste Brief an die Korinther, 11th ed. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Göttingen, 1967), pp. 170-2, argues for a pre-Pauline source on several bases: (1) The content is not Pauline in character; (2) The immediate context is much more limited than the content of these clauses; (3) The ideas come from Stoic pantheism; (4) The earlier οὗδαμὲν and the use of "we" in confession style. Deichgräber, pp. 79 and 116, agrees in designating this as one of the early confessions to have two members.

The history, contents and backgrounds of this form has been treated thoroughly by: Hans Lietzmann, Symbolstudien I-XIV (Darmstadt, 1962), pp. 47-60 (esp. 47-48); Erik Peterson, Eis Theos (Göttingen, 1926); and Eduard Norden,

however, do they manifest a non-Pauline pattern?

Again, the answer is not so unequivocal. The only attributival clauses having a form similar to these in the Homologoumena are the doxologies (Rom 16:27; Gal 1:5) and three clauses of Romans 9:4-5. Even that similarity concerns only the relative constituent and the absence of the copula. There are no other compound attributival clauses in Homologoumena; nor are there any which manifest the chiasmic pattern found in each of these. Although a pleonastic αὐτός is a common Semitism in biblical relative clauses,⁷⁵ it is found in the Pauline relative clauses only in this passage.⁷⁶ Thus, we can safely conclude that the peculiarities of the two relative clauses in I Corinthians 8:6 may well indicate a pre-Pauline origin.

That I Corinthians 1:30-31 has been shaped by and perhaps derived from traditional wisdom materials in Hellenistic Judaism or early Christianity has been claimed by Conzelmann among others and there are good reasons outside of

Agnostos Theos; Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede (Darmstadt, 1956), pp. 241-250.

⁷⁵F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, Robert W. Funk, trans. (Chicago, 1961), para. 297. Cf. also Nigel Turner, Syntax. Vol. III of A Grammar of New Testament Greek by James Hope Moulton (Edinburgh, 1963), pp. 9 and 325 and Matthew Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh, 1967), pp. 100f.

⁷⁶Even here it is not a pure case of pleonasm since, in effect, it falls in what might be considered a parallel clause. The αὐτὸ τοῦτο in Gal 2:10 is hardly pleonastic.

the form of the passage for supposing that this is the case.⁷⁷ Does the relative clause itself indicate a pre-Pauline origin?

I Corinthians 1:30-31 differs from the other equative clauses of the Homologoumena in several important ways. It uses ἐγενήθη rather than a form of εἶναι. No other Pauline equative clause has a compound IDN, nor do any contain source or purpose constituents. The only other Pauline equative clause having a constituent besides SBJ, EQU and IDN is Philippians 3:19b which, like I Corinthians 1:30-31, has a benefactee constituent.

Romans 2:6-8 is a modified citation of Psalms 62:13.⁷⁸ This quotation introduces an extended section &

⁷⁷The style--the hypostasization of σοφία, δικαιοσύνη, ἀγιασμός and ἀπολύτρωσις and the predication of these substantives to Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is one indication of the influence of non-Pauline materials on this text.

Second, much of the vocabulary is rare in the Homologoumena, but common in the wisdom speculations of Hellenism and Judaism. A more common Pauline treatment with several of the same stems is found in the series of predicates in I Cor 6:11, interestingly, in an exactly reversed order. The wisdom parallels, which are beside the point can be found in Hans Conzelmann, An die Korinther, pp. 67-8.

Third, and more significant, not only does the clause conclude with a rather free quotation of Jer 9:23, a careful comparison of Jer 9:22f and I Cor 1:25-31 shows numerous parallels between the two passages. Cf. esp. Jer 9:23: ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος, ποιῶν ἔλεος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

⁷⁸Two interrelated changes are made in the quotation. The second person pronoun is replaced by the relative in the third person and the person of the verb is likewise changed to third person.

on retribution (vs. 6-11 and perhaps more) reminiscent of the style of casuistic law codes. Is there evidence that this section has been shaped by such traditional materials?

The simple relative clause in v. 6 has the constituent order that we have come to expect in Paul. But following the modified citation, and obviously joined to it, are a series of constructions in which a different situation prevails. The pattern of these constructions is two undergoers, each preceded by an extended substantival participle. The participial constructions function as benefactees, but are in the dative plural, in contrast to the dative singular in the quotation on which they depend. These two lengthy constructions are equivalent to the equally lengthy protases in casuistic codes. The undergoers in these two constructions equal the apodoses in such codes. Each undergoer anticipates the predicate ἀποδώσει in the relative clause. The first undergoer ζῶντες αἰώνιων is in the accusative as one would expect with ἀποδώσει; however, the second, ὁργὴ καὶ θυμὸς is in the nominative, evidently the result of an anacoluthon. There is no other Pauline relative clause quite like this one, and Kendrick Grobel's argument would justify our finding the influence of pre-Pauline materials in this passage.⁷⁹

⁷⁹Kendrick Grobel, "A Chiastic Retribution-Formula in Romans 2," in *Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag*, Erick Dinkler, ed. (Tübingen, 1964), pp. 255-61. Beginning with the observation that Rom 2:6-11 reads like a well-known statement of the position which Paul is attempting to refute, Grobel turns

One hesitates to tackle Philippians 2:6-11; the problems are so complicated and the literature is so immense. Although there is little agreement on the authorship and no satisfactory arrangement of strophes has gained universal acceptance, nonetheless it is almost universally agreed that this passage is part of an early Christian hymn.⁸⁰ For our

to the structure of the passage. Using other studies which have noted reversals in the middle of the passage, he establishes the presence of a seven member chiasmus (or fourteen member--A-G and G'-A'). Lund and Jeremias have demonstrated that such chiastic patterns are common in Jewish thought. Although he gives no evidence of the presence of this particular retribution formula in some non-Pauline source, Grobel successfully demonstrates its pre-Pauline additions and modifications.

⁸⁰ Johannes Weiss, Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik (Göttingen, 1897), pp. 28-9, first called attention to the poetic and rhythmic character of Phil 2:5-11. That the passage is a Christological hymn was first noted by Hans Lietzmann, Messe und Herrenmahl (Bonn, 1926), p. 178. Most scholars of note have followed Weiss and Lietzmann in this identification.

The classic analysis of the hymn is still that of Ernst Lohmeyer, Kyrios Jesus. Eine Untersuchung zu Phil 2, 5-11. Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl. Jahrgang 1927/8, 4. Abhandlung; (reprinted Darmstadt, 1961). The most influential modification of Lohmeyer's analysis is that of Joachim Jeremias, "Zur Gedankenführung in der paulinischen Briefen," Studia Paulina in Honorem Johannis de Zwaan Septuagenarii, J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik, eds. (Haarlem, 1953), pp. 146-154.

The most extensive treatment of this passage and of the history of scholarship is found in R.P. Martin, Carmen Christi: Philippians 11. 5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 1-62 esp. Although no satisfactory arrangement of the strophes has received universal acceptance and the question of the authorship of the hymn is far from settled, there is little argument among scholars against its being recognized as a primitive Christian hymn.

purposes the question is: does the relative clause itself indicate a pre-Pauline background?

The relative clause in Philippians 2:6-8 is like the form of no other relative clause in the Homologoumena.⁸¹ It manifests a total disregard for Behaghel's Law, while even the unusual clauses discussed in the last few pages generally follow that rule. The clause is compounded with three different predicates. The arrangement of constituents with each of these predicates are visibly stylized as the maps will show:

CNC:ptcph	IDN:n	PRD:vd	UND:inph
UND:prn	PRD:vt	INS:ptcph	REF:ptcph
TEM:ptcph	PRD:vt	UND:prn	INS:ptcph

There are four main constituents in each with each predicate; all non-nuclear constituents are represented by clause level constructions. Each line has two clause-level and two word-level constituents. The arrangement of predicates and undergoers is chiasmic. Although none of the clauses follow the regular Pauline orders for transitive or ditransitive clauses, and Behaghel's Law is regularly ignored, it is impossible to determine any effect of emphasis on the order of this clause.

⁸¹ Even Rom 4:18-21, perhaps the second most complicated relative clause in the Homologoumena and the one most like Phil 2: 6-8, only superficially resembles the relative clause in this passage. The Romans clause lacks the chiasmic patterns as well as the careful balancing of clause-level subordinate constructions.

Thus, the conclusion seems justifiable that the forms of at least seven relative clauses in the Homologoumena have been shaped by or are themselves pre-Pauline traditional materials. The arguments are strongest for Philippians 2:6-8. They grow progressively weaker for Romans 2:6-8; I Corinthians 1:30-31; 8:6 (bis); Romans 16:27 and Galatians 1:5. Interestingly, the external arguments grow progressively stronger in much the same order.

6. Summary

Two of the original three questions can now be answered unambiguously. (1) The order of constituents in the relative clauses of the Homologoumena is not as free as had been alleged for Greek generally, (2) because four basic factors determine constituent order in almost every case in almost every relative clause. Table IX(p.221) and Table X (p. 229) demonstrate just how regularly constituent order follows the four basic principles: Behaghel's Law, Construction Type, Clause Type, Emphasis. It is important to remember that these are style traits or tendencies and not rules that the author of the Homologoumena invariably follows.

Have traditional formulations affected the constituent order in any of the clauses of the Homologoumena? In a few cases it has been demonstrated that it has. The test used throughout this study (i.e. Does the form of the clause at this level conform to the regular patterns of this

epistle?) has been useful, but not infallible. In some cases differences in constituent order have called attention to formulae which had been identified before. In others, differences in style led to the identification of formulae which had not been described before. However, it is most interesting that only Philippians 2: 6-8, of those clauses which are regularly asserted to be creedal or hymnic fragments, possessed a constituent order which distinguished it from the normal constituent patterns of the Homologoumena. Again, it must be emphasized that the test has not proved infallible.

The constituent patterns of the relative clauses in the Homologoumena are patterns which are much more common in Semitic languages than they are in Greek. These characteristics: (1) the verb regularly first, (2) oblique personal pronouns, especially enclitic forms, regularly coming immediately after the verb, and (3) actors and undergoers, as well as subjects and attributes in those regularly following the verb, make a strong argument for a Semitized Greek throughout the relative clauses of the Homologoumena. Perhaps this explains the failure to distinguish liturgical formulae. On the other hand, the almost total absence of the pleonastic personal pronoun is a telling argument against any theory of a translation Greek (or Greek as a second language of the author) and in favor of a common language context which has been shaped by the influence of the

Septuagint.⁸²

B. CONSTITUENT ORDER AMONG THE ANTILEGOMENA

1. The Common Language Context: An Overview

The assertion that there exists a common language context influenced by the Septuagint (and perhaps by

⁸²The problem in this instance is determining what is 'normal' or 'regular' Greek order. Most style books assume that Greek has a completely free word order. However, Schwyzler, Op. cit., passim and others indicate that the most frequent order of nuclear constituents was +Subject +Object +Predicate and that particles, enclitic verbs and enclitic pronouns tend to come early in their clauses. It is these observations which contrast with the order of the Pauline relative clauses.

On the order of constituents in Hebrew clauses see: Heinrich Friedrich Wilhelm Gesenius and E. Kautzsch, Hebrew Grammar, 2nd Engl. Ed., Rev. by A. E. Cowley (Oxford, 1910), para. 135, 140-142, passim; Carl Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax (Neukirchen, 1956), para. 121-23, 48, 64, 138, passim; K. Schlesinger, "Zur Wortfolge im hebräischen Verbalsatz," Vetus Testamentum III (1953), pp. 381-390.

The complete absence of such noted Hebraicisms and Aramaisms as the pleonastic pronoun seems to argue against either translation Greek or the Greek of an author who thought in a Semitic language. The better solution seems to be that the Greek of the New Testament generally (Biblical Greek to use Turner's phrase) is that of a community whose language has been shaped by the prayers and LXX reading of the Hellenistic synagogue. This suggestion which was made by Albert Wifstrand, "Stylistic Problems in the Epistles of James and Peter," Studia Theologica I (Aarhus, 1948), pp. 170-182 and "Lukas och Septuaginta," Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift XVI (Lund, 1940), pp. 243-262, would accord with Norden's suggestion (Agnostos Theos, p. 183) that some of the Oriental hymns were composed in Greek and with Nigel Turner's (Syntax, pp. 4-5, passim) argument for a Biblical Greek or at least a Greek strongly influenced by the Septuagint. As Wifstrand himself noted, this would also provide the best explanation for the evidence for the alleged diatribe style, which Bultmann claimed to find throughout the Homologoumena.

the major Pauline epistles as well) is greatly strengthened by the observation that the same patterns are found and the same principles of constituent order apply in the Antilegomena as did in the Homologoumena. This is the inescapable conclusion which results from either an analysis of the relative clauses in the Antilegomena or from surveying Charts I and II. This means that the answer to our third question is positive also.

In fact, not only do the same patterns and same principles apply in the Antilegomena, but they also apply in most of the Antilegomena with even greater regularity. Only II Thessalonians and Ephesians have as many exceptions of Behaghel's Law as one usually finds in the Homologoumena. Only II Timothy omits the verb with any frequency. While the Antilegomena has proportionately fewer two-membered clauses, the verb is found immediately after the relative in a larger proportion of the clauses. Only the Pastorals reveal any tendency not to place the verb as early as possible, another evidence of the more refined style of these epistles. Only Colossians places absolute pronouns after the verb with any regularity. Colossians and the Pastorals usually place the nominative forms of personal pronouns after the verb.

Although the relative clauses of the Antilegomena are longer on the average than are those in the Homologoumena, they do not usually contain as many nuclear constituents.⁸³

⁸³In addition to the relative and the verb, almost no clauses in the Antilegomena contain more than one additional nuclear constituent. Col 1: 23b, 25; 2:19;

Nonetheless, the only exception to the order of nuclear constituents which we have discovered to indicate clause-type in the Homologoumena is the intransitive clause in Colossians 3:6: $\delta\iota' \ \& \ \epsilon\rho\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \ \eta \ \delta\rho\gamma\eta \ \tau\omicron\upsilon \ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. Emphasis has affected constituent order in the Antilegomena also, in each case moving a constituent to the initial position. It should be noted, however, that fewer clauses have been affected by emphasis.

This common language context, which is the most obvious result of the study of constituent order in the relative clauses of the entire Pauline Corpus, is perhaps the most important result also. Certainly its significance is augmented by the discovery of concrete style traits appearing regularly which distinguish Semitic constituent order from the more common Greek orders. It does not, however, mean that there are no significant differences or stylistic peculiarities in particular texts or epistles; neither does it imply that these epistles necessarily have the same author.⁸⁴ Rather, the discovery of this common set

Eph 2:3; 4:16; I Tim 2:7; 6:10; II Tim 1:11; 3:8; 4:8 are the exceptions. It is interesting that we shall find evidence to indicate that each of these has been shaped by traditional formulae except perhaps II Tim 3:8 and 4:8.

⁸⁴ Rather it tends to suggest a common language context for early Christianity such as that suggested by Wifstrand and Turner (cf. note 82 above). If this common language context is a valid assumption, and the evidence is strong that it is, then the stylistic differences between different writings are even more important than have been assumed, since many of the similarities probably come from the wider context. The lack of adequate studies in the language of the Septuagint and of Hellenistic Jewish materials is especially obvious at this point.

of patterns and principles (1) makes it possible for us to speak more specifically about the language community in which the entire corpus was written and (2) makes it necessary that any discussion of differences or peculiarities be set in that common context.

There are significant and even frequent stylistic peculiarities which distinguish most of the Antilegomena to a greater or lesser degree from the Homologoumena and from each other. To these differences we now turn.

2. II Thessalonians

The relative clauses of II Thessalonians differ with regard to the form of the clause from those of the Homologoumena less than the relative clauses of any other of the Antilegomena.⁸⁵ Nonetheless, there are a number of style traits at the clause-level which distinguish this epistle from the accepted epistles. The relative clauses of this epistle are longer than the average clause in the Homologoumena, but even the longer clauses are less complex than are the longer relative clauses of the Homologoumena. A larger proportion rigorously adhere to Behaghel's Law.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ The proportion of clauses having the verb in the second position and having the verb come as early as possible is normal for an epistle of the Homologoumena. The distribution of clause types, the position of oblique forms of personal pronouns, and effect of emphasis is like that of the epistles of the Homologoumena.

⁸⁶ Both exceptions (2.8, 10) seem to be the result of emphasis. Evidence of the effect of Behaghel's Law can be seen in the non-Pauline separation of POS:r from its nominative substantive in 2:9 (cf. n. 89 below) and in the

No clauses in this epistle omit the verb.⁸⁷

Although the particles καί and οὐ immediately precede the verb in 1:11 (εἰς δ καὶ προσευχόμεθα πάντοτε...); 2:14 (εἰς δ καὶ ἐκάλεισεν ὑμᾶς...); and 2:10 (ἀνθ' ὧν τὴν ἀγάπην... οὐκ ἐδέξαντο...), as is normal in the Homologoumena, each of these clauses differs from the usual Pauline patterns.⁸⁸

The order of the single equative clause in 3:17 (ὃ ἐστὶν σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ) is the same as that of the equative clauses in the Homologoumena, but this use of ὃ ἐστὶν is not found there. Neither are identifiers with qualifying phrases common there. The order in the attributive clause in 2:9 (οὗ ἐστὶν ἡ παρουσία κατ' ἐνέργειαν...) follows exactly the dominant Pauline order, except that in Pauline clauses in which the relative is a possessor constituent, the thing possessed is always moved

arrangement of prepositional phrases containing personal pronouns. (e.g. 1:11 εἰς δ καὶ προσευχόμεθα πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν.

⁸⁷ After r immediately: 1:4; 2:9, 15; 3:3, 4, 6, 17. After καί which follows r: 1:5, 11; 2:14. After r and another nuclear constituent: 1:9; 2:8, 10.

⁸⁸ Καί is found before the predicate in 1:5, 11; 2:14. In 1:11 and 2:5 the εἰς δ introduces a new sentence; although καί seems to go with the verb in each case, it is difficult to determine how it functions. See Chapter II, pp. 174-175.

In the relative clauses of the Homologoumena the negative particle οὐ always precedes a verb in the second position, which is always emphasized by reason of contrast. In II Th 2:10 (ἀνθ' ὧν τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἐδέξαντο...) the negative precedes the verb at a latter point in the sentence but UND is the emphasized constituent.

to a position immediately after the relative.⁸⁹

Emphasis accounts for the order of nuclear constituents in 2:8 (ὃν ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἀνελεῖ... καταργήσει...) and 2:10 (above). However, it is impossible to explain with certainty the position of the undergoer in 1:9 (ὅτινες δίκην τίσουσιν ὄλεθρον αἰώνιον...) ⁹⁰ The interruption of the undergoer phrase in that clause is also

⁸⁹POS:r only fourteen times in the entire corpus (Rom 2:29; 8:34a; 9:4a, 5a; II Cor 8:18; 11:15; Gal 3:1; Phl 3:19a, 19b; 4:3; II Th 2:9; Eph 3:7; Col 1:23b; 25. Seven of the Pauline examples have no verb at all, but in no case is the relative in the genitive separated from the substantive which it qualifies. In the attributival clauses in the Homologoumena in which POS:r and COP:vcp appear (Rom 8:34a; II Cor 11:15) SBJ, which is the substantival construction qualified by POS:r is found immediately after the relative and before the copula. Perhaps the strongest argument for this being a Pauline characterist is found in οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμοῦς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐσαυρωμένος. In the unusual order of this clause κατ' ὀφθαλμοῦς is apparently drawn to the relative by the possessive relationship.

In contrast to what seems to be a pattern in the Homologoumena, Eph 3:7 and Col 1:23b, 25 all manifest the separation and order found in II Th 2:9.

⁹⁰2:8: ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς contrasts with ἄνομος in the preceding clause and is therefore emphasized.

2:10: τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας contrasts with τέρασιν ψεύδους... ἀπάτη ἀδικίας in 2:9 and is emphasized.

1:9: emphasis may explain the position of δίκην in this clause, but that cannot be determined with certainty. Or, the order may be result of a speech habit; after all, δίκην and τίνω are commonly joined together in definable contexts (Cf. Bauer, *Lexicon*, p. 826). In any case, the heavy use of hapaxlegomena (τίνω, δίκη, ἵσχυς, ἐνδοξάζω) and expressions not commonly found in the Homologoumena, even in apocalyptic passages, emphasize the basic non-Pauline character of this section.

not characteristic of Pauline relative clauses. Unless this latter passage is influenced by a traditional judgment formula, there is no reason to suspect the influence of traditional formulae on the thirteen relative clauses of II Thessalonians.

3. Colossians

It has been shown that a phrase-level (Chapter 1) and at a word-level (Chapter 2) some of the characteristic style traits of the Homologoumena are even more rigorously applied in Colossians than they are in any of the accepted epistles, and this in spite of the continued evidence of the peculiarity of those clauses. The same is also true at a clause-level. Only two clauses in the epistle do not rigorously follow Behaghel's Law:

Colossians 2:19

ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα

διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων [ἐπιχορηγούμενον
καὶ συμβιβάζόμενον

(ἐξ οὗ...σῶμα) αὖξει τὴν αὖξιν τοῦ θεοῦ.

Colossians 2:23

ἅτινά ἐστιν

(λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας ἐν...ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος),

(ἅτινά ἐστιν) πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκός.

There are fewer variations in the orders of nuclear constituents than one finds in the average epistle in the Homologoumena. Thus, emphasis is needed to explain constituent order only in 2:19 (above) and perhaps in two of

the four cases employing nominative personal pronouns.⁹¹

Every relative clause in Colossians contains a verb and that verb occurs in the second position more frequently in Colossians than in the Homologoumena.⁹² Although Colossians has many long relative clauses, it also contains more two-membered clauses than the other Antilegomena.

Colossians is also marked by a peculiar style (not without parallels in, but certainly not common in, the Homologoumena) and that peculiarity of style manifests itself at every level. The appositional style of Colossians would lead us to expect that this epistle would have an unusually large number of relative clauses and also that a disproportionate number of them would be equative clauses.⁹³

The equative clauses of Colossians form two distinct groups: (1) those in which the equative is manifested by a form of εἶναι;⁹⁴ and (2) the three in which the equative is a form of γίνεσθαι (1:23b, 25; 4:11). The former differ from the equative clauses in the Homologoumena in the frequency of the epexegetical ὅτι clauses⁹⁵ and

⁹¹1:28; 3:7

⁹²The verb follows the relative immediately in Colossians where one would expect another constituent in the Homologoumena; e.g. 1:23b, 25; 2:3 and perhaps 2:23 (also 3:6 where ACT in an intransitive clause follows PRD).

⁹³Cf. Excursus I, esp. p. 96.
1:7, 15, 18, 23b, 24, 25, 27b; 2:10, 17; 3:5, 14; 4:11.

⁹⁴1:7, 15, 18, 24, 27b; 2:10, 17; 3:5, 14.

⁹⁵Cf. Chapter I, pp. 57, 96-98.

in the tendency to manifest the identifier by a long noun phrase, often with appositives.⁹⁶

The three equative clauses containing a form of γίνεσθαι do not have a common pattern and differ from the equative clauses of the Homologoumena in several respects. The benefactee constituent μοι in 4:11 (οἷτινες ἐγενήθησαν μοι παρηγορία is unusual among equative clauses. The other two::

Colossians 1:23b

τοῦ εὐαγγελίου

οὗ ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ Παῦλος διάκονος.

Colossians 1:25

ἡ ἐκκλησία

ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν...

have no explicit parallels in the entire Corpus.⁹⁷

⁹⁶ IDN is often quite long, esp. 1:7, 15, 25; 2:10. Characteristic of the style of this epistle, IDN often has an appositional expression--1:15, 18, 27b.

⁹⁷ These two clauses are obviously affirmations of ecclesiastical authority. Eduard Lohse has pointed out the non-Pauline character of these statements by observing that Paul never speaks of himself as a "minister of the Gospel," or a "minister of the Church." Cf. Eduard Lohse, Colossians and Philemon, William R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris trans. Hermeneia--A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, Helmut Koester, ed. (Philadelphia, 1971), pp. 67, 72-3. Paul more regularly speaks of receiving the apostleship (Rom 1:5) or being given grace (1 Cor 3:10). This latter phrase is also found in 1:25 and Eph 3:2.

Several factors indicate that in these passages we may be dealing with the beginnings of a traditional formula for claiming ecclesiastical authority. (1) The form is found one or more times in each of the Antilegomena except 1 Thessalonians, but is not found in the Homologoumena at all (the closest parallel there is Rom 11:13--see below). (2) In each the author is affirming his authority, usually

The one intransitive clause containing an actor constituent (3:6 δι' ἧς ἔρχεται ἡ ὁργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ) not only does not follow the usual Pauline order, but manifests an order that is surprising in this particular case.⁹⁸

Scholars have frequently claimed to find evidence of traditional materials, especially of liturgical and

over against false teachers, and vis-a-vis his reader(s). (3) While the form is quite constant, it regularly departs from the usual style trait of ἐγὼ before verbs in relative clauses.

While much more research must be done to prove that this is a traditional formula, one cannot but suspect it when comparing the examples in the Antilegomena:

Col 1:23b	οὗ	ἐγενόμην	ἐγὼ Παῦλος	διάκονος	
Col 1:25	ἧς	ἐγενόμην	ἐγὼ	διάκονος	κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν
Eph 3:7	οὗ	ἐγενήθην		διάκονος	κατὰ τὴν δωρεάν
I Tim 1:11	ὁ	ἐπιστεύθην	ἐγὼ		
I Tim 2:5	εἰς ὃ	ἐτέθην	ἐγὼ	κῆρυξ ἀπόστολος διδάσκαλος	ἐν πείστει ἀληθείᾳ
II Tim 1:11	εἰς ὃ	ἐτέθην	ἐγὼ	κῆρυξ ἀπόστολος διδάσκαλος	
Tit 1:3	ὁ	ἐπιστεύθην	ἐγὼ		κατ' ἐπιταγὴν

The closest parallels in the Homologoumena are:

Rom 11:13 ἐφ' ὅσον μὲν οὖν εἰμι ἐγὼ ἔθνων ἀπόστολος, ... and

I Cor 12:28 οὗς μὲν ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, δεύτερον προφήτας, τρίτον...

In the examples in the Antilegomena, the antecedent is always the church, the gospel or the proclamation.

⁹⁸ While Behaghel's Law may explain the position of ACT:nph in 3:6, see for contrast Rom 14:21 (ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀδελφός σου προσκόπεται) and I Cor 10:11 (εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήντηκεν.)

confessional formulae, in Colossians 1:15-20 and 2:10-12. Just as was discovered at a phrase-level (Chapter 1) and a word-level (Chapter 2), so also at a clause-level these parallel relative clauses do not differ stylistically from the other relative clauses of this epistle.⁹⁹ The former passage is composed of two long, carefully constructed, parallel, equative relative clauses which are each qualified by parallel appositives and balanced subordinate constructions. While the two parallel relative clauses in 1:15-20 are longer than most of the clauses of Colossians, in every way they conform to the style of the relative clauses of this epistle.

⁹⁹Since Eduard Norden's now classic study of oriental hymnic style, there has been a widely accepted consensus that Col 1:15-20 has been shaped by oriental hymnic style (if not actually a foreign fragment introduced by the author of Colossians at this point in his epistle). The bibliography on these passages is too extensive to list at this point. The reader is advised to consult the following: Eduard Norden, Agnostos Theos (Stuttgart, 1913), pp. 251ff. Josef Kroll, Die christliche Hymnodik bis zu Klemens von Alexandria. Verzeichnis der Vorlesungen an der Akademie zu Braunsberg (Darmstadt, 1968). Archibald M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, 2nd rev. ed. (Philadelphia, 1961), passim. Ernst Käseman, "A Primitive Christian Baptismal Liturgy," Essays on New Testament Themes. W. J. Montagne, trans. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 41 (London, 1964), pp. 149-168. Reinhard Deichgräber, Gotteshymnus und Christus Hymnus in der frühen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen (Göttingen, 1967) pp. 143-155.

Two of the clauses in 2:10-12 (-13 ?) are transitive relative clauses; the form of these clauses conforms to the Colossian pattern for such clauses. This does not mean that 1:15-20 or 2:10-12 do not contain liturgical fragments, nor does it imply that these passages have not been shaped by hymnic formulae; it simply means that there are no linguistic grounds at a clause-level for identifying them as such.

On the other hand the shape of the clauses in 1:23b, 25; and perhaps 2:19 is rather foreign to the style of the author. This alien shape coupled with the existence of parallel forms in other documents probably indicates the influence of traditional formulae on these clauses.¹⁰⁰

¹⁰⁰On 1:23b, 25, cf. III, n. 96. Col 2:19 is the only clause in that epistle to break Behaghel's Law, the only example of a non-nuclear constituent and/or participial construction either before or within the arrangement of nuclear constituents and the only Colossian clause in which the verb does not come as early as possible.

This clause is so contrary to the normal style of this epistle that one would be inclined to identify it as an alien piece, if a clear parallel could be found in addition to Eph 2:21 and 4:16. Interestingly the Ephesian examples are better integrated into their contexts and are more at home with the style of that epistle, than is Col 2:19 in its context and in the style of this epistle.

Many scholars have noted the problem with the vocabulary and the grammar (i.e. the undergoer with this particular verb), but none to my knowledge have noted the style problem.

4. Ephesians

Chapter I especially, but Chapter II also, noted that the relative clauses of Ephesians were distinct in style from those of the Homologoumena, and yet these chapters also pointed out that these clauses often utilize certain style traits found in the Homologoumena in an almost universal and stereotyped form. This particular set of circumstances is even more the case at a clause-level.

The relative clauses of Ephesians are verbose and almost interminable; only two (4:1 ἧς ἐκλήθητε and 5:4 ἃ οὐκ ἄνηκεν)¹⁰¹ are two-membered, the smallest proportion of any epistle in the Corpus except Titus. The clauses are not lengthened by apposition, as they are in Colossians, but by subordination, as is more common in the accepted epistles. Behaghel's Law is rigorously followed in all but six clauses.¹⁰² Five of the exceptions are the result of putting a πᾶς construction early,¹⁰³ a Pauline

¹⁰¹Perhaps one should also include 3:20 ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ὧν αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν.

¹⁰²2:3, 21; 3:5, 15; 4:16; 6:16.

¹⁰³2:3 has καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες immediately before and ποτε immediately after PRD:vi. In Paul one would expect this order with (1) a constituent introduced by καί, (2) ἡμεῖς, (3) πάντες and (4) PRD:vi.

2:21 has πᾶσα οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένη before PRD:vi. This is usual in the Homologoumena with (1) πᾶς and with (2) PRD:vi. Only the position of the participle is unusual, but this is a style characteristic of Ephesians.

3:5 is a combination of two Pauline traits: the negative before the verb and an introductory TEM. However, no other constituent comes before the negative particle in the relative clauses of the Homologoumena.

tendency become a rule in Ephesians. Nominative personal pronouns, always introduced by καί, always precede the verb¹⁰⁴ and oblique forms, when used as clause-level constituents, always follow the verb immediately.¹⁰⁵ The verb is in the second position (23/36) and it also comes as early as possible (29/36) in a larger proportion of clauses than is usual in the Homologoumena.¹⁰⁶

In contrast to this excessive employment of characteristics found in the Homologoumena, the relative clauses of Ephesians also give evidence of the peculiarities which distinguish this epistle from the others. In spite of the verbosity of the relative clauses, they usually possess a limited number of nuclear constituents¹⁰⁷ and

3:15 has a long noun phrase introduced by πᾶς before PRD:vt.

4:18 varies in several ways: (1) πᾶν τὸ ὄμμα is in the second position; (2) a lengthy TEM:ptcph comes between ACT and other nuclear constituents; (3) UND:nph precedes PRD:vt. This clause represents the epistle's greatest departure from the normal patterns of the Homologoumena. Nonetheless, it or at least its first two traits are characteristic constructions in this epistle.

6:16 has the very long phrase πάντα τὰ βέλη τοῦ πονηροῦ τὰ πεπυρωμένα before PRD:inf. However, this placing of UND:nph before PRD:inf is normal in modal clauses in the Homologoumena.

¹⁰⁴ καὶ ἡμεῖς in 2:3; καὶ ὑμεῖς in 1:13a; 2:22.

¹⁰⁵ 1:6, 24--ἡμᾶς; 1:8--εἰς ἡμᾶς; 6:22--πρὸς ἡμᾶς.

¹⁰⁶ The exceptions (1:13b; 2:2, 3, 21; 3:5, 15; 4:16, 19) would all be expected in the Homologoumena.

¹⁰⁷ Only Eph 2:3 and 4:16 possess two or more nuclear constituent in addition to r and PRD.

Thirteen of the transitive clauses contain nuclear constituents other than the relative and the predicate. In each case where the actor or undergoer precedes the verb,

the non-nuclear constituents are regularly, but not invariably, successively subordinate. Often these non-nuclear constructions are at best loosely related to the clause in which they occur.¹⁰⁸ As one would expect from a study of the style of this epistle, Ephesians contains more equative clauses (8x)¹⁰⁹ and fewer attributive clauses (5:18 only) than is normal in the Homologoumena.

A distinct peculiarity of the Ephesian relative clauses is the frequency with which a participle or participial phrase occurs early in the relative clause. A clause which will illustrate this tendency (as well as the typical Ephesians use of the absolute adjective) is

Ephesians 2:21

ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα οἰκοδομη
 συναρμολογουμένη
 αὖξει εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν κυρίῳ.¹¹⁰

evidence suggests that it has been moved out of its regular order. In 2:22 ACT: καὶ ὑμεῖς precedes as expected. In 3:15 and 4:16 long ACT:nph introduced by forms of πᾶς precede. The preliminary TEM in 4:16 is explained in III, n. 103. UND:αὖξουσιν in 4:16 also precedes ποιεῖται; undergoers frequently precede forms of ποιῶ. As we shall see in III, n. 115 below, 4:19 is shaped by a traditional formula in which PRD is often the final constituent.

None of the eight relative clauses having nuclear constituents after the predicate have them in contrasting arrangement. (+PRD UND--1:6, 7; 2:4; 3:12. +PRD:vt +BEN--1:8; 3:5; 6:22. +PRD:vt +ACT:nph--2:10). Therefore, it is impossible to ascertain the order beyond the statement of fact that all nuclear constituents in transitive relative clauses follow the predicate.

¹⁰⁸Cf. Chapter I, pp. 61-63 and Excursus II, pp.

¹⁰⁹1:14, 23; 3:7, 13; 4:15; 5:5; 6:2, 17.

¹¹⁰1:13a, 13b; 2:21; 3:4; 4:16, 19. Such

In every example, except 4:16, the participle is not in a phrase. This stylistic peculiarity, which has very few parallels in the remainder of the Corpus, is characteristic of the style of Ephesians.¹¹¹

Temporal constituents come early in seven relative clauses in Ephesians. In all but two (2:2 ἐν αἷς ποτε περιπατήσατε and 3:5 ὁ ἐτέραις γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη ...) this temporal constituent is a participial construction.

The order of nuclear constituents in 3:7 (ὃ ἐγενόμην διδάκονος κατὰ...) is different from that which would be expected in the Homologoumena. This clause also differs from the other equative clauses in Ephesians: the others either possess no other qualifiers or else utilize appositives; this one contains a qualifying prepositional phrase.¹¹²

While the clauses containing the absolute agree with the Homologoumena in placing the absolute as near the beginning of the clause as possible, they are in other ways quite distinct. The absolute in the relative clauses of Ephesians is always an adjective in a substantive phrase in

constructions are not unheard of in the Homologoumena (e.g. II Cor 10:1 ἀπὸν); but they are not found in one out of seven relative clauses, nor are the Pauline constructions usually as long as 4:16.

¹¹¹ Participial constructions are found before or among the nuclear constituents in non-relative clauses in 1:15; 2:1, 3, 4, 17; 4:25; 6:13.

¹¹² Contrast 1:14, 23; 3:13; 4:15; 5:5; 6:2, 17.

contrast to its use as a pronoun in the Homologoumena. In each case in Ephesians, the substantival phrase is qualified by a subordinate construction, either a participial phrase (2:3, 21; 4:16; 6:16) or a prepositional phrase (3:15). The only clear parallel to these constructions in the Corpus is Colossians 2:19. Neither the frequency nor the form of these constructions is found in the Homologoumena, although they mesh well with the style of Ephesians.

The role of emphasis in Ephesians is not as clear cut as it is in the Homologoumena. Nominative forms of personal pronouns and absolute constructions probably come early because of emphasis. Emphasis explains the position of the temporal constituent in 3:5 (ὁ ἑτέροις γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη...); emphasis in this case is the result of a contrast with the following: ὡς νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη On the other hand, it is doubtful if emphasis will explain the position of the participial constructions among the nuclear constituents in five clauses.¹¹³

The problem of the influence of traditional formulations on the style of Ephesians is quite complex. Regularly scholars have claimed that Ephesians 1:3-14, 20-23; and 2:4-10, 14-18, contained hymnic fragments and Schille has asserted that the entire epistle has been shaped by liturgical style.¹¹⁴ While the larger question of liturgical

¹¹³ Cf. note 111 above.

¹¹⁴ The literature dealing with alleged style in Eph 1-3 is too extensive to detail here. Among the more important classical and recent works treating this question are:

influence must remain unanswered, it is now possible to state that the relative clauses in the specific passages do not differ in internal form from the other relative clauses of the epistle. Again, it must be emphasized that this assertion does not mean that these are not liturgical forms or formulae, but that there is no evidence at a clause-level which distinguishes them as alien to the style of the context in which they occur.

Ephesians 3:7 is the only clause in Ephesians that differs from the other clauses of its type. This difference would not be sufficient to lead to expect a traditional formula, if there were no parallels in other epistles. The forms in 4:19 and in 2:21; 4:16 have several parallels in this epistle, although each seems peculiar when found in other epistles.¹¹⁵

Reinhard Deichgräber. Gottes hymnus und Christus Hymnus in der frühen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache und Stil der Frühchristlichen Hymnen. (Göttingen, 1967); Helmut Kramer. "Zur sprachlichen Form der Eulogie Eph 1, 3-14." Wort und Dienst IX (1967); Vernon H. Neufeld, The Earliest Christian Confessions. Vol. 5: New Testament Tools and Studies. Bruce M. Metzger, ed. (Grand Rapids, 1963); Eduard Norden, Agnostos Theos. (Stuttgart, 1913); Ernest Percy. Die Probleme der Kolosser und Epheserbriefe. (Lund, 1946); A. van Roon. Een onderzoek naar de authenticiteit van de brief aan de Efeziërs. (Leiden, 1969); James M. Robinson. "Die Hodayot-Formel in Gebet und Hymnus des Frühchristentums". Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen. Walther Eltester and F. H. Kettler, eds. (Berlin, 1964). Pp. 194-235; Gottfried Schille. Frühchristliche Hymnen (Berlin, 1962, 1965).

¹¹⁵ Parallels for 4:19 are found in I Tim 1:6, 19; 6:10, 21; II Tim 2:17; Tit 1:11b and perhaps Rom 1:32. Parallel for 2:21; 4:16 are Colossians 2:19. Cf., however, III, n. 109.

5. I Timothy

Chapters I and II indicated that greater variations in style are characteristic of the relative clauses of I Timothy than of those in Colossians and Ephesians. In this way this epistle is more akin to the style of the Homologoumena than are Colossians and Ephesians. This circumstance is also true at a clause-level. Although only two clauses (1:7 ἀ λέγουσιν and 4:6 ἡ παρηκολούθηκας are limited to two members) the average length of the relative clauses is not as long as those in Colossians and Ephesians. Also the number of clauses with the verb in the second position (14/24) is within the normal ratio of the Homologoumena. The number of exceptions to Behaghel's Law, and the role played by emphasis in constituent order, is slightly greater than for the Homologoumena in general.

Nonetheless, I Timothy contains several constructions and constituent patterns which distinguish it, both from the Homologoumena and from Colossians and Ephesians. The only nominative form of the personal pronouns in these clauses is ἐγώ (1:11, 15; 2:7). In contrast to the practice of the Homologoumena, it follows the verb in each case.¹¹⁶ In the Homologoumena one would expect οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων in 6:16a before the verb.¹¹⁷ The two

¹¹⁶1:11 and 2:7 are both examples of the form asserting ecclesiastical authority. Cf. III, n. 97.

¹¹⁷Contra I Cor 2:8.

equative clauses (3:15 ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος, στυλὸς καὶ ἐδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας and 4:10 ὅς ἐστιν σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα πιστῶν) are by length and the use of appositives more reminiscent of Colossians than of the Homologoumena.

It is notable that the figures for I Timothy in Columns 4 and 5 of Table I are the same; this means in no case is the verb separated from the relative in I Timothy by a construction that we would expect in that position in the Homologoumena. This made even more striking by the complete lack of particles and by the tendency to put nominative forms of personal pronouns after the verb. On the other hand, emphasis has had a pronounced effect on constituent order in many of these clauses.¹¹⁸

Four clauses in I Timothy depart significantly from the constituent orders that one finds either in the Homologoumena or elsewhere in I Timothy; they are:

I Timothy 1:19

ἦν τινες

ἀπωσάμενοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν

(ἦν τινες) ἐναυάγησαν.

¹¹⁸E.g. in 1:4 ἐκζητήσεις contrasts with μᾶλλον ἢ οἰκονομίαν θεοῦ τὴν ἐν πίστει therefore, it is emphasized and situated before the predicate. Πάντας ἀνθρώπους in 2:4 is emphasized and moved to the second position. The author is struck in 4:3 by the audacity of his opponents: they would dare to prohibit the things which God has created to be received with thanksgiving. Consequently, ὁ θεός follows the relative. Emphasis also explains the position of καίτοις ἰδοὺ in 6:15.

I Timothy 6:21

ἦν τινες

ἐπαγγελλόμενοι

(ἦν τινες) περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἡστούχησαν.

and by analogy:

I Timothy 1:6

ὧν τινες

ἀστοχῆσαντες

(ὧν τινες) ἐξετράπησαν εἰς μετατολογίαν,

θέλοντες εἶναι νομοδιδάσκαλοι,

μὴ νοοῦντες μήτε...μήτε... .

I Timothy 6:10

ἦς τινες

ὀρεγόμενοι

(ἦς τινες) ἀπεπλανήθησαν ἀπο τῆς πίστεως

καὶ ἑαυτοὺς περιέπειραν ὀδύναις πολλαῖς.

Both the peculiar form of these clauses, the impossibility of explaining that form by emphasis, and the existence of significant parallels to this form in Jewish and Christian polemical literature indicates that these clauses are shaped by and probably are derived from traditional formulae.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁹To my knowledge this form has never been analyzed. Dibelius and Conzelmann note that Christian writers began to characterize their opponents with statements introduced by τινες quite early. They call attention to the fact that I Tim 1:6 is an example of this tendency and that the form already seems to be established. Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, 3rd ed. Vol. 13 of Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Günther Bornkamm, ed.

I Timothy 1:11 and 2:7 are examples of what we have called a formula for ecclesiastical authority.

I Timothy 6:16b is a common benediction.¹²⁰

6. II Timothy

Chapter I especially and, to a lesser degree, Chapter II also indicated that (1) the relative clauses of II Timothy are quite distinct in style from those of the Homologoumena, although (2) II Timothy, like the other Pastorals, shows some of the flexibility of the clauses from the Homologoumena, and (3) II Timothy manifests several idioms which are found in the Homologoumena but in no other epistle of the Antilegomena. Each aspect of this conclusion is supported by the evidence available at a clause-level.

(Tübingen, 1955), p. 18.

Several factors indicate that these relative clauses have been shaped by the influence of traditional polemical forms. Each of them manifests parallelism membrorum and each differs in the same ways completely from the style of its context. Each characterizes the opponents as τινες. Each used either an aorist form of ἀποχέω or ἀποπλανᾶω and each use τὴν πίστιν substantively of the body of Christian truth.

It is impossible at this point to illumine the history of the form. Because its closest parallels are Rom 1:25, 32 and because of the ideas formed in both, it seems likely that the form is pre-Christian, and perhaps Stoic. The reference to teachers of the Law and empty words would suggest that the form was mediated to Christianity through Hellenistic-Jewish missionary preaching.

120

The peculiarities of this form were discussed above (n. 97).

The relative clauses of II Timothy are similar to those of the Homologoumena in several ways. A comparable ratio of them (20/23)¹²¹ follow Behaghel's Law. Three relative clauses omit the verb (2:20a, 20b; 4:18), a practice common in the Homologoumena but uncommon in the Antilegomena. The ratio of clauses having the verb in the second position (15/20) compares favorably with the Homologoumena.¹²² The variety, frequency and use of particles is more like that of the Homologoumena than it is like any of the Antilegomena.¹²³

Nonetheless, at a clause-level this epistle has a number of traits which clearly distinguish it from the style of the Homologoumena. Only I Timothy in our Corpus has as many clauses in which the verb is not as early as possible. That fact is made even more striking when one considers the frequent use of particles and of attributive clauses. Attributive clauses are used more frequently in this epistle than any other, clauses which regularly have the verb in the

¹²¹1:3, 5, 6a, 6b, 11, 12a, 12b, 15; 2:2a, 2b, 7, 9, 17, 20a, 20b; 3:14; 4:8, 13, 15, 18.

¹²²1:3, 5, 6a, 6b, 11, 12b, 15; 2:2a, 7, 9, 17; 3:14; 4:8, 13, 15. 2:20a, 20b; and 4:18 have no verbs.

¹²³Μέν and δέ follow and are suffixes of the relative in 2:20 (ἀ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν ἀ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν). Notice: Δέ in 3:8 is a connective with the preceding statement. Καί in 4:15 (ὃν καὶ σὺ φυλάσσου) is additive and emphasizes the personal pronoun. In 1:12a (οὐκ ἦν αἰτίαν καὶ ταῦτα πάσχω, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπαισχύνομαι) the particle is also additive, but probably belongs to the whole clause (cf. II, p. 193). Notice that οὐκ is used with the second of the compound predicates in this clause.

second position.¹²⁴

Although the statistics on particles, pronouns and emphasis if the relative clauses of II Timothy correspond favorably, a careful comparison of the actual use presents a rather mixed picture. Μέν and δέ are used in 2:20a, 20b; but the passage is copied from Romans 9:21. Καί is used in a normal Pauline manner in 4:15, but not in 1:12a. Εὖ precedes the verb in 4:15, but ἐγώ follows it in 1:11. Emphasis may affect constituent order in several passages (e.g. 1:12a, 13; 2:2b; 3:8), but it is unusually difficult to demonstrate that emphasis is the key to order in those passages.

Several clauses in II Timothy give indication of the influence of traditional formulae, although in each case that evidence would be weak were it not for the existence of parallels from other epistles. II Timothy 1:11 (εἰς δὲ ἐτέθην ἐγὼ κηρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος καὶ διδάσκαλος) is an example of the form for ecclesiastical authority discussed above;¹²⁵ only the position of ἐγὼ distinguishes it in this epistle. The absence of the copula in 4:18 (Ὡς ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν.) as well as the presence of ἀμήν, distinguish this benedictive formula. The polemical

¹²⁴1:6b, 15; 2:2b, 17, 20a, 20b; 4:18.

¹²⁵Cf. n. 97 above.

form in II Timothy 2:18:

οἷτινες [περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἡστούχησαν
λέγοντες ἀνάστησιν ἤδη γεγονέναι,
καὶ ἀνατρέπουσιν τὴν τινων πίστιν.

is a modification of the pattern seen in I Timothy 1:6 and elsewhere.¹²⁶ No other relative clause in this epistle utilizes the subordinate participial phrase of means. The use of οἷτινες and the prepositional phrase before the verb also distinguishes this clause from the other relative clauses of this epistle. II Timothy 2:20a, 20b (καὶ ἃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν ἃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν), are a different kind of traditional formulation; that is, they are apparently shaped by the influence of a Pauline statement (Romans 9:21). They are distinguished in this epistle by the use of the particles and the absence of the copula.

7. Titus

Chapters I and II indicated that Titus showed some of the flexibility of style at a phrase-level and word-level which also characterizes the relative clauses of the Homologoumena, while at the same time manifesting several idioms which either distinguish this epistle or which relate it to I or II Timothy. At a clause-level the comparison to the Homologoumena is less favorable, but the characteristics shared with the other Pastorals is still obvious.

¹²⁶Cf. n. 119 above.

The verb in the relative clauses of Titus is in the second position with disproportionate frequency (8/10); the only exceptions are 1:11b (to be discussed below) and 1:11c (ὃ μὴ δεῖ). Even the nominative forms of the personal pronouns follow the verb (1:3 ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγὼ ...;¹²⁷ 3:5 ὃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς).¹²⁸

The only relative clause in which the regular orders for nuclear constituents is not followed in this epistle and the only one in which emphasis may affect word order is

Titus 1:11b

οἵτινες ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν

διδάσκοντες ὃ μὴ δεῖ αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν.

However, the constituent order of this clause, which is closely related to similar clauses in I and II Timothy (especially II Timothy 2:18), is more likely the result of the influence of a traditional polemical form.¹²⁹

The other passage which reveals the influence of traditional formulations on the shape of the clause is

Titus 1:3

ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγὼ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ.

This clause is another example of the ecclesiastical

¹²⁷Cf. n. 97 above.

¹²⁸In fact, ἡμεῖς begins its clause in 53/58 times in the Corpus. In Rom 15:1 and II Cor 9:4 it follows imperatives, a situation to be expected. The best mss. omit the pronoun in Rom 8:32. This leaves only Tit 3:3, 5 without explanation.

¹²⁹Cf. n. 119 above.

authority formula which we have seen earlier and this example is more closely related to the other cases of this form in the Pastorals, than it is to the examples in Colossians and Ephesians or to the proto-type in the Homologoumena.¹³⁰

C. CONCLUSIONS

This chapter began with three basic questions which can now be answered with certainty. The order of constituents in the relative clauses of the Pauline Corpus (1) is not as free as has been alleged for Greek generally, (2) because there are four basic factors which determine constituent order in almost every case in almost every relative clause, (3) both in the Homologoumena and in the Antilegomena. The discovery that there are four common describable traits (Behaghel's Law, Construction Type, Clause Type, Emphasis) which determine constituent order in almost all of the relative clauses throughout the entire Corpus, is probably the most important result of the study in this chapter. Certainly any discussion of the peculiarities of any given text or epistle must be set in the context of the recognition of these common traits. The importance of this circumstance was enhanced by the observation that these traits manifest themselves in distinctly Semitic or Septuagintal constituent orders.

¹³⁰Cf. n. 97 above. Observe especially the choice of the verb in I Tim 1:11.

1. The Style of the Homologoumena

Behaghel's Law, Construction Type, and Clause Type affect the constituent order of every relative clause in the Homologoumena. However, in the Homologoumena these traits remain just that, characteristics of the author's style. This is shown by the important role that emphasis plays in the constituent order of the relative clauses of each epistle.

Added testimony to the role played by these style traits upon the constituent order of the clauses is to be found in the fact that, whenever the regular patterns were not followed, there was usually reason to suspect the presence of traditional formulations. Thus, variations in style argued for the influence of pre-Pauline formulae on the shape of Philippians 2:6-8; Romans 2:6-8; I Corinthians 1:30-31; 8:6 (bis); Romans 16:27; and Galatians 1:5. Philippians 2:6-8 is the only one of the alleged liturgical and creedal forms on this list.

2. The Antilegomena Contrast with the Homologoumena

Given the common stylistic context, the differences in style between the Homologoumena and the various Antilegomena is quite interesting and significant. In general, these contrasting traits support the conclusions of Chapters I and II. That is, while the points of contrast in style are not sufficient to disprove Pauline authorship in any case, they do add to the evidence (1) against the

authenticity of each of the Antilegomena, (2) for the observation that the style of Colossians differs from the Homologoumena more than Ephesians does (and the two are often different in style), (3) for the claim that the Pastorals are often closer in style to the Homologoumena than are Colossians or Ephesians.

3. Comparison of Styles Within the Antilegomena

This chapter also adds support to observations about relationship within the Antilegomena which grew out of the phrase-level (Chapter I) and word-level (Chapter II) analyses. Simply stated these conclusions are: (1) Although Colossians and Ephesians have a special relationship which can be demonstrated in the relative clauses at each level of analysis, (2) they are often individually closer in style to different aspects of the Homologoumena than to each other. (3) The Pastorals are clearly related to each other and (4) are often closer to the style of the Homologoumena than are Colossians and Ephesians. The evidence for these observations is not as strong in this chapter as it was in Chapter I, but it is still worth documentation.

(1) The chapter makes even clearer the special relationship which exists between Colossians and Ephesians. Of a more general nature, one notes that the clauses of these two epistles tend to be much longer than those found in any other epistle. They more regularly have the verb first than any other comparable set of relative clauses. Both epistles employ relative clauses containing a copula

verb more frequently than do other epistles. Each of these generalizations is an important stylistic observation.

Of a more specific character, that most peculiar of Colossians pieces (2:19) is obviously related in both form and content to Ephesians 2:21 and 4:16; there it is not strange at all. In both form and vocabulary, the Colossians (1:23b, esp. 25) and Ephesians (3:7) examples of the so-called ecclesiastical authority formula are closer to each other than either is to the parallels in the Homologoumena or in the Pastorals. These examples will suffice to demonstrate the special relationship, although others could be cited.

(2) The evidence is not all one way. With the exception of the equative clauses, the distribution of clause types in Colossians is quite in keeping with that of the Homologoumena. Colossians contains more two-constituent clauses. Although some of them are quite long (so also in Romans 4:18ff.), the relative clauses in Colossians do not trail off into a succession of subordinate clauses (i.e. there is no debate of the closure of any relative clauses in Colossians). Behaghel's Law and the nuclear constituent orders of the different clause types are followed almost without exception. The nominative personal pronouns in the plural precede the verb (1:28; 3:7) but ἐγὼ follows the copula in 1:23b, 25 as it does in Romans 11:13.

On the other hand, Ephesians shows more of the flexibility of the Pauline clauses. There are more

exceptions to Behaghel's Law and emphasis plays a larger role in constituent order. Absolute pronouns and adjectives always precede the verb. So do nominative personal pronouns. Temporal constructions often precede the verb as they do in the Homologoumena. Participial phrases also occur on occasion before or among the nuclear constituents, practices also found on occasion in the Homologoumena (e.g. Rom 1:32; II Cor 10:1).

(3) Both style and particular traits at a clause-level make clear that a special relationship also exists among the Pastoral Epistles. For example, all three have examples of both the so-called ecclesiastical authority formula and the traditional formulation against heretics. However, in the former the examples in II Timothy and Titus have more in common with I Timothy than they do with each other. In contrast, the example of the latter form in II Timothy and Titus belong to one sub-type and all four examples in I Timothy belong to a different sub-type.

Several characteristics of a more general character distinguish three epistles as a group from the remainder of the Corpus. They make very little use of any particles (except in "Pauline" passages in II Timothy). Nominative personal pronouns and absolute pronouns usually follow rather than precede the verb. In only two cases, (the personal pronoun in II Timothy 4:15 and perhaps *ὁλούς οἰκούς* in Titus 1:11b) does a construction come between relative and verb which one would expect in either the

Homologoumena or Colossians-Ephesians. II Timothy generally manifests more of the characteristics of the Homologoumena than do I Timothy or Titus.

(4) As a group the relative clauses of the Pastorals are stylistically closer in some ways to the relative clauses of the Homologoumena than are those in Colossians-Ephesians. For example, the relative clauses of the Pastorals are much closer in length and complexity to those of the Homologoumena than are the relative clauses of Colossians-Ephesians. The Pastorals show much the same varieties of forms and arrangement, rather than almost woodenly following the same pattern or patterns as do most of the clauses of Colossians especially, but also Ephesians. The Pastorals have about the same proportion of clauses in which the verb actually immediately succeeds the relative as does each of the Homologoumena (that proportion is quite constant throughout the Homologoumena). The distribution patterns, with the exception of the attributive clauses in II Timothy, are basically what one would expect in a normal epistle of the Homologoumena.

EXCURSUS III

CLAUSE TYPES AND CONSTITUENT ORDERS

1. Determining Clause Types

One of the major weaknesses of earlier studies of Greek word order is the failure of any known author to distinguish clause types. This failure makes even the most carefully garnered group of statistics difficult to use or interpret. This weakness is made even more striking by the fact, universally known among grammarians, that clause type affects word-order and construction function in almost all of the Indo-European languages.

Robert E. Longacre has suggested criteria for determining and distinguishing clause types, criteria which are useful in the analysis of Greek clauses. His basic principle is that two clauses belong to different clause types if,

(a) there are at least two structural differences between them, and (b) at least one of these differences involve the nuclear and/or obligatory constituents.¹

¹Robert E. Longacre, Grammar Discovery Procedures, A Field Manual (The Hague, 1964), pp. 48-50.

Among the structural differences that Longacre (pp. 48-60) suggests are: (1) "An obligatory difference in the ordering of similar elements, or a marked statistical preference for different ordering of such elements." Because this is the question at issue here the different ordering must be a secondary question, utilized only after other bases for classifying are found.

Using the Longacre criteria, a careful analysis of the relative clauses in the Homologoumena leads to the firm conclusion that there are six types of relative clauses in the Pauline corpus. Each of these six is structurally distinguishable and each has a very regular constituent order. The types are transitive, di-transitive, intransitive, modal, equative and attributive.

In the discussion which follows the basic constituent order for each type of clause in the Homologoumena will be stated and discussed. The evidence supporting each order will be presented and the exceptions noted. Since in

(2) "A different internal structuring of sequence manifesting clause level constituents." (An example of this in the English language would be the difference in substitution classes in the two sentences: "The man murdered the doctor," and "the man is the doctor." "The doctor" in the former sentence may be substituted for only by other substantives; in the latter one may substitute attributives and prepositional phrases.)

(3) A difference in the number of nuclear constituent slots in the two clauses being compared. (Because of the well-known Greek predilection for ellipsis one has to emphasize the "constituent slots." Greek writers habitually omitted words which could be supplied from the context. On the other hand one must avoid the commentators' fondness for supplying allegedly missing words.)

(4) Differences in transform potential signal distinct clause types (Cf. the contrast between transitive and ditransitive clauses below).

(5) A difference in the sub-classes of words filling a particular slot is a fifth possible distinguishing structural characteristic. (In the sample sentences under two above the predicate constituent is manifested in one case by a transitive active verb and in the other by a copular verb. These verbs belong to structurally distinguishable sub-classes which can be validated outside the context of the clauses being studied by observing (1) that the list of verbs which can be substituted for each are not co-extensive, (2) the transform potentials are completely different, (3) the words themselves may not fill all the same slots.

most cases the variations are clearly the result of Behaghel's Law and emphasis in a particular clause, the exceptions will be discussed individually under that section.²

2. Transitive Clauses

A total of 145 or slightly more than half of the relative clauses in the Homologoumena are transitive clauses. In twenty-one of these the predicate is passive. The remainder are active. There is no significant difference in the orders of transitive active and transitive passive clauses.

Transitive clauses may have any number of constituents. They may contain as many as five nuclear constituent slots: the predicative, the actor, the undergoer, the benefactor, and the relative (i.e. if this pronoun does not function in one of the other nuclear slots). Any one or combination of the constituents may be ellided in a Greek relative clause and the relative may, of course, function as either actor, undergoer or benefactor.³ The inflection of each of these constituents (with the exception of the relative when it is neither undergoer, actor or benefactor) is determined by the inter-relationship between each and the predicate.

The regular pattern for transitive relative clauses

²Cf. III, pp. 232-235.

³There are, in fact, no relative clauses in the Homologoumena with five nuclear constituents. Among the clauses with four are II Cor 10: 3; 13:10.

in the Homologoumena is apparently $r + PRD:vat + BEN:prn + ACT + UND (+Ben:pph) \pm pph \pm cl.$ One has to say "apparently" because there are only three clauses containing both an actor and an undergoer in which neither of these constituents is represented by the relative and the nuclear constituents in these three do not follow an identical pattern.⁴ This statement of regular order is based on the analysis of comparative arrangements of nuclear constituents.

Thirty-nine of the transitive clauses in the Homologoumena have expressed actors and of these twenty are represented by the relative.⁵ Although only slightly more than half of those having expressed actors which are other

⁴ Rom 2:16	$\pm r$	$+PRD$	$+ACT$	$+UND$
Rom 4:6	$\pm r$	$+ACT$	$+PRD$	$+UND$
II Cor 4:4	$\pm r$	$+ACT$	$+PRD$	$+UND$

⁵Actor expressed by relative: Rom 1:25, 32; 2:6; 3:30; 4:18; 8:32; 14:2; 14:5a, b; 16:4, 6, 12; I Cor 4:5; 11:27; II Cor 1:10; 8:10; 9:11; Phil 2:6; 4:3; I Th 5:24; 6:9. It is noteworthy that the antecedent of the relative in most of these examples is $\theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ (Rom 2:6; 3:30; 8:32; II Cor 1:10a); $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (I Cor 4:5); $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (Phil 2:6). I Th 5:24 shows a similar pattern. The exceptions to this list of *nomina sacra* antecedents are Rom 4:18 ($\alpha\beta\rho\alpha\alpha\mu$); Rom 14:2, 5a, b ($\delta\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu, \delta\varsigma \delta\acute{\epsilon}$); I Cor 11:27 ($\delta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu$).

Actor expressed by substantive: Rom 2:16; 4:6; 8:24; 11:7; 15:18; 16:4, 17; I Cor 2:7, 8; 6:18; 15:36; II Cor 1:4, 6; 4:4; 10:8, 13; 13:10; Gal 6:7; Phil 3:12. Again the *nomina sacra* predominate-- $\theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ (Rom 2:16; 4:6; I Cor 2:7; II Cor 1:4; 4:4a; 10:3); $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (II Cor 10:8; 13:10); $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ (Phil 3:12); $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (Rom 15:18); $\iota\sigma\rho\alpha\eta\lambda$ (Rom 11:7). Of the remaining relative clauses having expressed actors four utilize the personal pronouns ($\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ --Rom 16:4; $\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ --II Cor 1:6; $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$ --I Cor 15:36; $\sigma\upsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ --Rom 16:17), and three use indefinite expressions ($\tau\iota\varsigma$ --Rom 8:24; $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ --I Cor 6:18; Gal 6:7). The other relative clauses with an expressed actor is I Cor 2:8 ($\sigma\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\omega\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon \tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$).

than relatives,⁶ the normal order is clearly +PRD +ACT. All of the cases in which the order varies at this point are the result of emphasis.⁷

Only two of the passive predicates have expressed actors,⁸ and both follow the predicate. In II Corinthians 1:4 ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ follows the undergoer αὐτοί, a situation that Behaghel's law would lead us to expect. Ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ in Philipians 3:12 comes immediately after the predicate.

Undergoers are found in all of the transitive clauses with active predicates except I Corinthians 3:5 (δὲ ὃν ἐπιστεύσατε) and I Thessalonians 5:24 (ὅς καὶ ἐποίησεν), and in seven of those with passive predicates.⁹ In eighty-five (85) of the transitive clauses in the Homologoumena, the relative itself is the undergoer.¹⁰ The remainder are

⁶After the predicate: Rom 2:16; 8:24; 11:2; 15:18; I Cor 2:7; 6:18; II Cor 1:4; 10:8; 13; Gal 6:7; Phil 3:12.

Before the predicate: Rom 4:6; 16:4, 7; I Cor 2:8; 15:36; II Cor 1:6; 4:4; 13:10.

⁷Cf. III, 232-235. Note also the use of personal and universal pronouns in five cases cited in n. 5 above.

⁸On the other hand δὲ plus the genitive designates the agent in I Cor 1:9; 12:8; 15:5; Gal 6:14.

⁹Rom 4:25 (ὅς παρεδόθη...); I Cor 4:6 (ὁ / γεγραπται); 12:8 (δίδεται λόγος σοφίας); II Cor 1:4 (παρακαλούμεθα αὐτοί); 3:14 (ὁ τι...καταργεῖται); Gal 3:1 (Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐσταυρωμένος); 6:14 (κόσμος ἐσταύρωται).

¹⁰Rom 1:2, 9; 4:17, 21; 25; 6:16b; 7:15a; 8:24, 25, 29, 30a, 30b, 30c; 9:23; 10:8, 11a, 11b; 11:2, 7; 11:22a, b; 15:18; 16:2, 17; I Cor 2:7, 8, 13; 3:5, 14; 4:6, 7; 6:18, 19; 7:1; 8:22; 9:2; 10:15, 16a, 16b; 20; 11:4a, 4b, 4c, 12a, 23a; 12:17; 14:37; 15:1a, b, 3, 15, 31,

either nouns, pronouns, phrases or clauses, and they are the ones which must be studied to determine constituent order.

An examination of all the relative clauses containing undergoers which are not relatives demonstrates conclusively that the regular order in the Pauline relative clause was +PRD +UND. Considering the much larger number of examples to be considered, an even smaller proportion - only seven - ¹¹ varies from this order than from +PRD +ACT. All of the exceptions, except perhaps Romans 1:32, are clearly the result of emphasis.¹²

36, 37; 16:3; II Cor 1:6, 13, 17; 2:4, 10b; 3:14; 5:10; 10:8, 13; 11:12b, 17; 12:21; 13:10; Gal 1:8, 9, 20, 23; 2:2, 4, 18; 4:19a; 5:21; 6:7; Phl 4:9; I Th 1:10; 3:9; Phm 5, 10, 12, 21.

¹¹Rom 1:32(αὐτὰ ποιοῦσιν...συνενδόκουσιν τοῖς πράσσουσιν); 5:2a (καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχίζαμεν), 11 (τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν); 8:32 (τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο...); Phl 3:8 (τὰ πάντα ζημιώθην καὶ ἡγοῦμαι σκύβαλα), 20 (καὶ σωτήρα ἀπεκδεχόμεθα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν).

¹²Two factors complicate the discussion of the relative order of predicate and undergoer. Twenty clauses have compound predicates, undergoers or both (Rom 1:5, 25, 32; 2:6; 3:30; 4:8, 18, 25; 5:2; 8:32; I Cor 4:5; 11:27; II Cor 1:10a; 8:10, 22; 12:6; Gal 3:1; 6:14; Phl 3:8, 16). Another seven clauses utilize a clause or clause level constituent as the undergoer (Rom 1:32; 8:15; 14:2; II Cor 1:10b; 8:10; Gal 3:1; Phl 3:8). In the latter examples, i.e., the clause-level undergoers, the undergoer always follows the predicate.

The picture is generally the same but somewhat more complicated in the clauses containing compound predicates, undergoers, or both. Romans 1:5 (ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν ...) and 3:30 (δικαιώσει περιτομὴν ...καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν) are both examples of transitive clauses containing a transitive single transitive active predicate and compound undergoers. In both the undergoer follows the predicate. The phrase level constituents in the former follow both undergoers because they go with the total clause. In the latter they are appended to the undergoer with which each prepositional phrase goes. Thus the patterns can be

At least twenty-two transitive clauses in the

represented as follows:

Rom 1:5 r + PRD + (UND)² + pph

Rom 3:30 r + PRD + (UND + pph)²

Five clauses in the Homologoumena have compound transitive predicates with accompanying undergoers. They present a more complicated picture because of questions of traditional sources (E.g., Rom 8:32; I Cor 4:5; 11:27; Phl 2:6; and perhaps even Rom 4:18), varying predicate types (E.g., Rom 4:18; Phl 2:6; 3:8), and clause closure (Romans 4:18). The simplest ones are found in I Corinthians 4:5 and 11:27, where each predicate has its own undergoer immediately following. In these passages the pattern is:

+r (+PRD + UND)² + adv.

Romans 1:32; 4:18; 8:32 and Philippians 2:6; 3:8 seem to present examples of a chiasmic pattern. If such is the case the pattern might be represented as follows:

+r + UND + PRD + CON + PRD + UND

 a b b a

That ancient writers were especially fond of this stylizing of material has long been recognized and that Paul and other New Testament writers employed it in a variety of ways and at a variety of levels is quite clear.

Romans 4:18 presents many complicated problems which are not treated by the commentaries. Because of the possibility that the two relative clauses in this passage have been shaped by stereotyped formulas from traditional materials discussion of these clauses is postponed to the section of this chapter dealing with non-nuclear Constituents Among the Nuclear Constituents. Omitting the non-nuclear constituents from consideration for the moment the pattern for 4:18-21 is:

+r +(PRD + UND) + PRD + (UND)² + (UND + PRD) + PRD.

The three relative clauses containing a compound predicate with a single undergoer present no problem, although the clause patterns differ slightly. In II Corinthians 1:10a the common undergoer follows the first predicate. The same pattern is found in II Corinthians 12:6. The clause-level undergoer in Philippians 3:18 was discussed above. As one would expect, the main body of this undergoer follows the second predicate. The patterns in these clauses can be depicted as follows:

II Cor 1:10a)

II Cor 12:6) r + PRD + UND + pph + PRD + pph

Philippians 3:18 r + (PRD)² + UND:cl

Homologoumena contain benefactee constituents, including examples in every epistle except I Thessalonians.¹³ Five of the benefactee constituents are relatives (Rom 4:6; I Cor 12:8; Gal 2:5; 3:1, 19b). In fourteen cases the benefactee follows the relative immediately. In three cases, the benefactee precedes the predicate (Rom 8:32; 16:4a; II Cor 9:2), and in each the change is clearly for emphasis on the benefactee constituent. In one (II Corinthians 2:4 ἢν ἔχω περισσοτέρως εἰς ὑμᾶς) an adverb intervenes between predicate and the succeeding prepositionally-governed benefactee. In this example, the sentence follows Behaghel's Law. Although few of the relative clauses have both a benefactee and a substantival actor or undergoer, the usual place of personal pronouns in the corpus and the occurrence of the benefactee between predicate and actor in II Corinthians 10:13 (οὗ ἐμέρισεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς μέτρου) and between predicate and undergoer in II Corinthians 9:2 (ἢν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καυχῶμαι Μακεδόσιν ὅτι Ἀχαῖα παρεσκεύασται...) and Philippians 3:16 (οὕς...ἔλεγον ὑμῖν...τοὺς ἐχθρούς)¹⁴ suggests that it usually follows the predicate immediately.

¹³Rom 2:6; 4:6; 8:32; 16:4a, 6; I Cor 11:23a; 12:8; 14:37; 15:1a; II Cor 2:4; 9:2; 10:13; 13:10; Gal 1:8; 2:4; 3:1, 19b; 5:21; Phil 3:18; Phm 5, 12. Perhaps ἐμοί in Gal 6:14 (δὲ οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται, καὶ γὰρ κόσμος) is also a benefactee constituent, although the κόσμος in the second half indicates that it is a dative of reference.

¹⁴In both of these examples the noun clause undergoer refers to and resumes the relative undergoer.

Thus we conclude that the regular Pauline pattern for transitive relative clauses is:

+ r + PRD + BEN + ACT + UND¹⁵

In this pattern any constituent may be moved to a position between the relative and predicate if it is emphasized.

Non-nuclear word-level constituents may also come between predicate and a phrase-level nuclear constituent. Any constituent or combination of constituents may be used as many times as desired.¹⁶

3. Di-transitive Clauses

There are eleven di-transitive clauses in the Homologoumena, with examples in every epistle except Galatians, I Thessalonians and Philemon.¹⁷ Although di-transitive verbs differ from transitive verbs, traditional Greek grammarians do not distinguish them and do not classify clauses according to verb type generally.¹⁸

¹⁵Rom 2:16 (ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ κρινεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὰ κρυπτά ...) is the only example of + r + PRD + ACT + UND in the Homologoumena. No examples of ACT and UND reversed are to be found in the relative clauses of the Homologoumenon. The arrangement + r + PRD + BEN + ACT is found in II Cor 10:13.

¹⁶Cf. e.g. + r + (PRD + UND)⁴ in Rom 4:18 and r + (PRD + UND)³ in Phl 2:6, as well as the compounding of benefactees (II Cor 10:13; Phm 5), predicates, actors and/or undergoers.

¹⁷Rom 2:15; 3:25; 6:16a; 9:24; I Cor 1:8; 4:17b; 12:28; II Cor 3:6; Phl 2:6; 3:8, 21.

¹⁸Usually transitive or intransitive verb types are treated rather summarily, if at all, by such grammarians. Cf., e.g. F. Blass and A. Debrunner (A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, 9th ed. Tr. and Rev. by Robert W. Funk, Chicago, 1961), pp. vii-viii, which provides no heading for such a discussion in his treatment of the syntax of the verb or in the brief section

Theoretically a di-transitive relative clause

on word order. Eduard Schwyzer, (*Griechisch Grammatik*. Vol 2: *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. 2nd ed. *Handbuch der Altertums Wissenschaft*. Walter Otto, ed. Munich, 1959), pp. 217-220, summarily treats the relationship of transitive and intransitive verbs, primarily examining the historical development and comparison to other Indo-Germanic verb systems. It is my personal conviction that this lack results from the emphasis on accident in Greek grammar and from the fact that most studies of syntax begin with individual words and particles and proceed to larger constructions rather than vice versa.

Although most di-transitive verbs may also in other sentences be used as simple transitive verbs, they form a special sub-class because these verbs may be used in the context: + r + PRD + UND + RCL/ATT.

The verbs which are di-transitive in the relative clauses are few in number: ἀναμνήσκω (I Cor 4:17); βεβαίω (I Cor 1:8); ἐνδείκνυμι (Rom 2:15); ἡγέομαι (Phl 2:6; 3:8); ἰκανόω (II Cor 3:6); καλέω (Rom 9:24); μετασχηματίζω (Phl 3:21); παριστάνω (Rom 6:16a); προτίθημι (Rom 3:25); τίθημι (I Cor 12:28; I Tim 2:7). Most of these verbs are derived from the transitive verb category; in fact τίθημι and καλέω are used as transitive predicates in Pauline relative clauses.

It is possible that δίδωμι, χαριτόω, ποιέω, Χαρίζομαι and other verbs should be classed as di-transitive because of transformations, one with the undergoer of persons (BPN) in the nominative and undergoer with the object of thing in the nominative. Nonetheless because (1) there exists no study on classification of all the di-transitive verbs in Greek and (2) the identification and classification of all the di-transitive verbs in the Pauline corpus is extraneous to the aims of this study, and (3) di-transitive verbs seem to be derived from transitive verbs, no attempt has been made to identify all the verbs which differ in transfer potential from the verbs discussed in this section and they do not generally govern a role of attributive constituent.

The second important structural difference between transitive and di-transitive clauses is the regular presence of role and attributive constituents in the latter. This constituent is found in all the di-transitive relative clauses (RCL: r--Rom 9:24

ROL: n/nph---Rom 3:25; 6:16a; I Cor 4:17b; 12:28; II Cor 3:6; Phl 2:6; 3:8

ATT: adj---Rom 2:15; I Cor 1:8; Phl 3:21)

Judged by the criteria stated above and on the basis of description of these clauses, the di-transitive classes are a distinct class type because they manifest two or more structural differences from transitive relative

may have six nuclear constituents (as opposed to five in transitive clauses): + r, + PRD, + BEN, + ACT + UND + (ROL/ATT). However, no di-transitive clause in the Homologoumena has more than four nuclear constituents.

In all the di-transitive clauses, except I Corinthians 4:17b and Philippians 2:6, the predicate immediately follows the relative. In the former exceptions ὑμᾶς is contrasted to Τιμόθεον, ... μου τέκνον ἀγαπητὸν καὶ πιστὸν ἐν κυρίῳ and so precedes the ἀναμνήσει. The contrast with ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων may put emphasis on οὐχ ἀρπαυμὸν in Philippians 2:6, but it is not easy to determine which constituents are emphasized in this passage.

Seven of the di-transitive relative clauses have actor constituents.¹⁹ All are relatives in the nominative case except ὁ θεός in Romans 3:25 and I Corinthians 12:28. In each of these exceptions the actor constituent immediately follows the predicate.

An undergoer constituent is present in twelve of the di-transitive relative clauses.²⁰ In all cases, except

clauses: (1) there is a difference in the number of regular nuclear constituent slots in the two clause types (six vs. five); (2) the two clause types have different transfer potentials; (3) different sub-classes of words fill the predicate slot; (4) the substitution classes for undergoer and role/attributive constituents are different.

¹⁹Rom 2:15; 3:25; I Cor 1:8; 4:17b; 12:28;
II Cor 3:6; Phl 2:6; 3:21.

²⁰UND: r---Rom 3:25; I Cor 12:28
UND: n/pn/nph---Rom 2:15; 6:16a; 9:24;
I Cor 1:8; 4:17; II Cor 3:6;
Phl 2:6; 3:21

I Corinthians 4:17b discussed above and the examples of UND:r the undergoer follows the relative. The voice of the predicate has no effect on the location of the undergoer. All of the di-transitive clauses have a role or attributive constituent. When it is not represented by the relative (Rom 9:24), this consistent regularly follows the predicate, the actor and the undergoer constituents when any or all of these are present in the clause. The single exception is Philippians 2:6 (ὅς...οὐχ ἀπαγγέλον ἡγήσατο το εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ), in which the role constituent (ROL) precedes the predicate.

Although there are not enough d_i-transitive clauses to justify an indisputable conclusion, it would appear that the nuclear constituent order of the Pauline di-transitive relative clauses is:

+ r + PRD + BEN + ACT + UND + ROL/ATT.

4. Modal Clauses

The Homologoumena contains twenty-three modal relative clauses with such clauses being found in every epistle except Philippians and II Thessalonians.²¹ Again traditional Greek grammars do not distinguish modal verbs or modal relative clauses.²²

²¹ Rom 1:27; 4:24; 7:15b, 15c, 16, 19a, 19b, 20; 9:16a; 18b; 12:3; I Cor 6:5; 7:36, 39; 10:13a, 13b; 12:23; II Cor 2:3; 5:4; 10:2; Gal 2:10; 4:9; 5:17; Phm 13.

²² Blass-Debrunner, *Op. cit.*, para. 392, does allude to the classes of verbs which often take an infinitive as a complement while discussing the particular characteristics of each of the verbs as being transitive,

Thirteen of the clauses in the accepted letters contain only +UND:r +MOD:vm (plus negatives and conditional particles). In these two-membered modal clauses the relative is regular the undergoer for the understood infinitival predicate (usually ποιεῖν).²³

The modal (MOD) in modal clauses regularly follows the relative. (The particles which are found before the modal are: connective particle καί--Gal 2:10; the conditional particle εἰ--Gal 5:17; the negative particles--Rom 7:16;

intransitive, impersonal or otherwise.

The structure differences which distinguish modal clauses are: (1) the verbs which may be substituted in the MOD slot are a distinct sub-class verbs; (2) the passive transformations of modal clauses differ from those of transitive and di-transitive clauses; (3) Modal clauses differ from other clauses in the number, classes, and orders of nuclear constituents.

The most common verb functioning as MOD in the relative clauses of the corpus is θέλω (Rom 7:15b, 15c, 16, 19a, 19b, 20; 9:18a, 18b; I Cor 7:36, 39; II Cor 5:4; Gal 5:17). Δύναμαι is also common (I Cor 6:5; 10:13b). Other modal relative clauses also employ βούλομαι (Phm 13), δεῖ (Rom 1:27; 2:3; II Cor 2:3), δοκέω (I Cor 12:23), εἶω (I Cor 10:13a), λογίζομαι (II Cor 10:2), μισέω (Rom 7:15c), μέλλω (Rom 4:24), and σπουδάζω (Gal 2:10). (As was stated in the discussion of di-transitive clauses, this list is complete only with regard to the relative clauses in the corpus. I am sure that there are other modal predicates but there is no study descriptively delineating this sub-class of predicates). Many of these predicates can also be used as simple transitive predicates. The obvious fact which distinguishes this sub-class of predicates from other transitives is the observation that all transitive predicates cannot be substituted for MOD in the clause:

+ACT +MOD +PrD:inf

²³Rom 7:15b, 15c, 16, 19a, 19b, 20; 9:18a, 18b; I Cor 7:36; Gal 5:17. In Rom 1:27 εἶδει except ἀπολαμβάνειν. In Rom 9:18a, 18b θέλει assumes ἐλθεῖν and σκληρύνειν respectively. Δύνασθε demands an infinitive meaning "to bear, withstand" in I Cor 10:13. θέλω anticipates γαμήθῃναω γαμήσαι in I Cor 7:39.

19b, 20; I Cor 10:13a; II Cor 5:4). The only exceptions are in Galatians 4:9 and Philemon 13. The $\epsilon\gamma\omega$ before the modal is to be expected in Philemon 13. Emphasis explains the arrangement in Galatians 4:9.

The infinitive in the modal clauses tends to be separated from the modal by any nuclear constituents which are found in the clause. This means that it often is found at the end of the clause or else immediately before any clause level constituents. Various constituents may appear between the modal and the infinitive. For example, the actor of the infinitive (II Cor 2:3), the undergoer (I Cor 10:13a; Gal 2:10), and the attribute with copular infinitive (I Cor 12:23) are constituents found between the modal and the infinitive in relative modal clauses. Prepositional phrases (Phm 13) and brief temporal constructions follow the infinitival predicate only when they are long (e.g. Rom 4:24 - the undergoer is a long attributive participle; I Cor 6:5 - the undergoer is a long phrase; and II Cor 10:2 - the undergoer contains two clauses). Of course, this would be in keeping with Behaghel's law.

The infinitives used to complete the verbal expression in modal clauses may be of any type (transitive active--I Cor 6:5; II Cor 2:3; 10:2; Gal 2:3; 4:9; Phm 13. Transitive passive--Rom 4:24; I Cor 10:13a; II Cor 5:4. Copular--I Cor 12:23). The actor for the infinitive is usually the same as the actor for the modal. The two exceptions to this practice are rather different from each

other. / *Εἶσι in II Corinthians 2:3 is a so-called impersonal verb and the actor in this case (με) precedes the infinitive ἵσταν. I Corinthians 10:13a utilizes a passive infinitive with an undergoer; the actor for the infinitive is not expressed but is clearly not ὁς.

The pattern of modal clauses is now quite plain.

It is:

+r +MOD:vm +ACT +PRD:infph

Furthermore, the arrangement of the parts of the PRD shows a tendency to situate the infinitives after most of its non-clausal adjuncts without regard to the function of the adjunct.

5. Intransitive Clauses

The Homologoumena contains twenty-nine intransitive relative clauses.²⁴ These clauses manifest a

²⁴Rom 2:23; 5:2b, 12; 6:2, 10a, 21; 8:3, 34b; 11:25; 14:15, 21; I Cor 7:37; 8:11; 10:11, 30; 11:21a, 21b, 26; 15:1c, 6; II Cor 4:6; 11:21; 13:3; Gal 2:4 (cf. v. 1. Gal 3:19a); Phl 2:15; 3:16; 4:10; I Th 2:3.

That the perfect forms of ἵσταν are regularly intransitive is accepted by all grammars and (cf. e.g. Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, 4th ed. Tr. and Rev. by William R. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. Chicago, 1957), pp. 382-3; Moulton, Jereb Hope and Howard, Wilbert Francis. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol II. Edinburgh, 1929) p. 241, and Blass-Debrunner, (Op. cit.), para. 97). Yet the predicate ἵσταν in I Corinthians 7:37 is followed by the nominative adjective ἑραστός. Is ἵσταν in this passage intransitive or is it copular, i.e., = ἵσταν? A. T. Robertson seems to come down on both sides of the question. In discussing the distinctions between adjectives and adverbs (A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research, Nashville, 1934), p. 549, he points out that scribes often missed the distinction and calls attention to this passage. Later when he is describing the differences between attributive and

striking regularity in the order of constituents.²⁵

Intransitive relative clauses have at least three, and perhaps four nuclear constituents; the relative, the actor, the predicate and perhaps the benefactor.²⁶

predicative adjectives (p. 656) he cites ἑδραῖος in I Corinthians 7:37 as a predicate adjective which makes an additional statement about a substantive rather than providing an incidental description of the substantive. The presence of the locative constituent ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, a constituent which occurs regularly with the intransitive forms of ἵστημι (cf. e.g. Rom 5:2b; I Cor 15:1c), and the frequent use of adjectives as adverbs (Robertson, *Op. cit.*, p. 657), leads me to identify ἑδραῖος as an adverb of manner rather than as a descriptive or predicate adjective. Bauer (*Op. cit.*, p. 383) apparently interprets it the same way.

²⁵Grammarians quite regularly distinguish intransitive from transitive verbs, (Schwyzer, *Op. cit.*, pp. 217-220; Blass-Debrunner, *Op. cit.*, para. 76, 148, 307-315) noting that (1) the distinctions are not always clear, (2) some transitive verbs tend to develop historically out of intransitive verbs and (3) intransitive verbs have not passive transformation. Word-order research, as was noted earlier, has made no distinction between kinds of predicates.

That intransitive relative clauses are a separate clause type is clear from the following structural distinctions: (1) The verbs manifesting PRD are a distinct subclass. (2) The intransitive relative clause has no passive transformation. (3) As we shall see, the number of nuclear constituent slots differs from other relative clause types. (4) Constituent order of intransitive relative clauses is as we shall discover, markedly different from all other relative clause types.

²⁶Four intransitive clauses in the Homologoumena and two in the Antilegomena contain BEN as a constituent:

Rom 8:34b ὃς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.

Rom 14:15 ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν.

I Cor 8:11b ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν.

I Cor 10:11 εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήντησεν.

II Th 1:5 ὑπὲρ ἧς καὶ πάσχετε.

Eph 6:20 ὑπὲρ οὗ πρεσβεύω ἐν ἀλύσει.

In each case except Rom 8:34b BEN is manifested by the relative. In every case BEN is governed by a preposition. Whether this should be counted as a nuclear constituent is

When the three constituents are all present they usually appear in just that order.

If the intransitive relative clauses are compared to the other relative clauses, the frequency of the appearance of the actor constituent is striking. In the Homologoumena it is present nineteen times, ten expressed by the relative²⁷ and nine times by some substantive.²⁸ The constructions which manifest the actor constituent vary considerably both in type and length, (e.g. Rom 5:12 πάντες; 11:25 τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν; 14:15 Χριστός; I Cor 10:30 ἐγώ; 15:6 οἱ πλείονες, etc.) yet all come as early in the clause as possible. Some of these may be explained as habitual and/or emphatic, but not all of them can be so explicated. In at least four passages (Rom 11:25; 14:21; I Cor 10:11; 15:6) this involves an infraction of Behaghel's Law.

The predicate in the intransitive relative clauses is often the only other constituent besides the relative and the actor.²⁹ It always follows the actor constituent when

debatable, since it does not apparently fit our working definition of nuclear constituents (e.g. those who form is in concord with the verb). However, no decision on this matter is necessary at this point since all but one are also relative constructions and therefore nuclear.

²⁷Rom 2:23; 6:2; 8:34b; I Cor 7:37; 11:21a, 21b; II Cor 4:6; 13:3; Gal 2:4; I Th 2:13.

²⁸Rom 5:12; 11:25; 14:15, 21; I Cor 8:11; 10:11, 30; 15:6; II Cor 11:21; Gal 3:19a, v. 1.

²⁹Rom 5:2b, 12; 6:10a, 10b, 21; 11:25; 14:15, 21; I Cor 8:11, 30; 11:21a, 21b; 15:1c, 6; II Cor 11:21; Phil 3:1b; 4:10.

that constituent is present and it precedes non-nuclear constructions except when such constituents are emphasized.³⁰

Romans 6:10a (ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν) and 6:10b (ὁ δε ζῇ) deserve special comment because both intransitive predicates have an accusative undergoer (ὁ), a characteristic which should indicate a transitive verb. That these two clauses are intransitive is indicated (1) by the use of these same verbs elsewhere³¹ and (2) by the lack of a second structural difference between them and the other intransitive relative clauses. The relatives in these clauses are accusatives of inner object, i.e. they refer to an unexpressed substantilized form of the predicates.

The regular pattern of nuclear constituents in the Pauline intransitive relative clauses is:

+ r + ACT + PRD:vi + BEN

This order is very significant, because it is so consistent while at the same time it differs so markedly from every other constituent pattern in the Pauline relative clauses.

6. Equative Clauses

Although their arguments were fallacious, traditional grammarians were correct in distinguishing clauses containing some form of εἶναι (or an equivalent) from other

³⁰Rom 2:23 ὃς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι; II Cor 13:3 ὃς εἰς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἀσθένει....

³¹Cf. e.g. the relative clauses in Rom 14:15; (ὅτι ἐπὶ οὗ Χριστοῦ ἀπέθανεν); I Cor 8:11.

Greek clauses.³² Such clauses are, in fact, two sub-types of relative clauses which are both distinct (1) from those clauses which contain a 'verb of action' and (2) from each other. Before the Equative relative clauses can be discussed, the distinguishing of equative clauses from

³²Traditional grammars operate on the basis of identifying linguistic phenomena by the use of technical terminology assumed to be analytical. Because the complement in clauses containing a copulative verb regularly agree in gender, number and case with the subjects, these complements were called subjective complements and assuming that such verbs merely connect the subject and the subjective complement the verbs were called copula, i.e., connecting verbs.

There are several problems here from an analytical and descriptive point of view. (1) All verbs connect. (2) The complement with finite forms of εἶναι may be genitive or dative in some circumstances and is often a prepositional phrase. (3) The traditional definition of the copulative verb, i.e. "a word which denotes being or state of being," when taken descriptively, would lead the grammarian to identify such Greek words as ἦναι, δουλεύειν and δουλέω as copulative verbs while ignoring the forms of εἶναι in various periphrastics. Obviously, neither the denomination nor the definition were descriptive and analytical. They were prescriptive in the sense that some people by a variety of means came to recognize copulative verbs as well as predicate nouns and adjective, and then, having arrived at this conclusion, prescribed the generally accepted grammatical technical terminology to the phenomenon.

The fact that methodology was inadequate and misconceived does not, however, invalidate the distinctions discovered by other means and then labeled. The so-called copulative clauses are obviously a distinct clause type when judged by the criteria used in this project. For example, (1) none of the PRD we have examined so far can be substituted for EQU or COP. The reverse is also true. (2) The transform potential of such clauses is radically different from any clause type we have examined thus far. (3) The nuclear functional slots in such clauses differ not in one or two details, but in every detail from the clause types described above. (4) The regularity with which nominative forms occur in both relative and complement must be regarded as a structural difference.

attributive clauses must be justified.

Equative relative clauses include all relative clauses which contain a substantival complement in the nominative case (i.e. the predicative nominative).

II Corinthians 4:4b is an example:

ὅς	ἐστίν	εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ
SBJ:r	EQU:vcp	IDN:nph

Attributive clauses³³ include all other clauses containing (or implying) one of the copulative verbs and a complement in any of the following categories: (1) adjective, (2) prepositional phrase, or (3) substantive in any case other than the subject. Pauline examples of this type would include:

Rom 1:25 (adjective complement)

ὅς	ἐστίν	εὐλογητός
SBJ:	COP:	ATT:

Rom 8:34a (prepositional phrase)

ὅς	ἐστίν	ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ
SBJ:	COP:	LOC:

³³These terms which are functionally descriptive are not without problems. Attribute is used technically at an earlier point in the dissertation to distinguish functionally the attribute from the head in endocentric constructions. In this sense many, if not most relative clauses are attributes of their heads or antecedents. Furthermore, traditionally all relative clauses have been regarded as attributive or adjectival clauses. But this difficulty seems to afflict every other equivalent functional designation which may be substituted in this circumstance.

A reading of Blass-Debrunner, *Op. cit.*, para. 127-142, 145, 27-273, etc., will demonstrate that grammarians regard it as two different kinds of complements for one type of clause. An examination of the materials dealing with "copulative verbs," "Subjective complements," "predicate nominative," and "predicate adjectives" in such grammars as Herbert Wein Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, Rev. by Gordon M. Messing. (Cambridge, 1963); Schwyzler, *Op. cit.*; Robertson, *Op. cit.*; and R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache II Satzlehre*. 3rd ed. by E. Gerth (Hanover and Leipzig, 1898-1904) will support this conclusion.

Rom 9:5a (other substantival form)

ὧν
POS:

οἱ πατέρας
SBJ:

The basic structural reasons for distinguishing equative and attributive clauses are three: (1) The two classes of complements are unable to fill the same slots elsewhere in the Greek language.³⁴ (2) The transform potential of each clause type is very different.³⁵ (3) The meaning of the verb is different in the two types of clauses.³⁶

³⁴For example, one can say in Greek, ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος, ὁ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ ἄνθρωπος, and ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος (or ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἀγαθός, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ) without changing the function of the construction or the meaning of ὁ ἄνθρωπος, but one cannot say ὁ πατήρ ἄνθρωπος or ὁ ἄνθρωπος πατήρ without changing the function of ἄνθρωπος. The same is also true when one attempts to substitute adjectives, prepositional phrases and substantives in the genitive or dative cases in the slots of other substantives.

³⁵An equative clause such as I Cor 3:11 may be transformed into an appositive; thus παρὰ τὸν κεῖμενον ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός becomes παρὰ τὸν κεῖμενον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν by describable and testable rules, with no change of meaning while transforming ἀπὸ Ἐπαφρᾶ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ συνδούλου ἡμῶν ὅς ἐστιν πιστός.. (Col 1:7) into ἀπὸ Ἐπαφρᾶ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ συνδούλου ἡμῶν πιστοῦ would change the meaning of the construction or else create two, no longer endocentric, constructions. The reverse is also true. On the other hand the transform potential of the adjectives, prepositional phrases and substantives (in cases other than that of the subject) used as complements in such clauses is exactly the same).

³⁶Εἶναι in equative relative clauses carries the basic meaning "equal" and the clause often is equivalent to id est. It further identifies by apposition the head construction. On the otherhand, the forms of εἶναι in the attributive clauses conveys the basic meaning "has this attribute" or "can be described as". The clause describes the head construction.

These three reasons are more than sufficient to distinguish equative clauses from attributive clauses.

Now we return to an examination of the Pauline equative clauses.

There are twenty-one equative clauses in the Homologoumena. Most utilize *ἐστίν*³⁷ or some other form³⁸ of *εἶναι* as EQU. One employs a form of *γίνεσθαι*³⁹ and four have the EQU unexpressed.⁴⁰

The regular pattern for Pauline equative clauses is as follows:

+ r + SBJ + EQU: vcp + IDN: n/nph

In all the Pauline clauses SBJ is manifested by the relative except:

I Corinthians 15:10

χάριτι δὲ θεοῦ εἰμι

ὃ εἰμι.

Galatians 5:10

ὁ δὲ ταρασσὼν ὑμᾶς βαστάσει τὸ κρίμα

ὅστις ἐὰν ᾖ.

II Corinthians 2:16a

ὅτι Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμέν... ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις

οἷς μὲν ὁσμή ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον.

³⁷Rom 4:16; 5:11; 16:5b; I Cor 3:11; 4:17a; II Cor 4:14b; Gal 3:16; 4:21b, 26; 5:19; Phil 1:28.

³⁸Rom 9:14a (εἰσιν); I Cor 3:17 (ἐστε); 15:10 (εἰμι); Gal 5:10 (ᾗ); Phil 3:7 (ᾧ).

³⁹I Cor 1:30 (ἐγενήθη).

⁴⁰II Cor 2:16a, 16b; Phil 3:19a, 19b.

II Corinthians 2:16b

ὅτι Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμέν...ἐν τοῖς σφζομένοις...,
οἷς δὲ ὁσμη ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωὴν.

Philippians 3:19a

οὓς πολλάκις ἔλεγον...τοὺς ἐχθροὺς τοῦ σταυροῦ...
ὧν τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια.

Philippians 3:19b

οὓς πολλάκις ἔλεγον...τοὺς ἐχθροὺς τοῦ σταυροῦ...
ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἡ κοιλία καὶ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν.

These six clauses differ from the other equative clauses in other ways as well. None of them contain ἐστίν, although Philippians 3:19a, 19b, presume this form of the copula. All of the equative clauses which omit EQU are included. Naturally every Pauline clause introduced by IDN:r is on the list above.

This identifier constituent in most of the equative clauses is a noun phrase in which the noun is defined by a genitival construction (e.g. Phl 1:28 ἔνδειξις ἀπωλείας),⁴¹ or a prepositional phrase (e.g. II Cor 2:16a above),⁴² or a dative of reference or benefaction.⁴³ In I Corinthians 1:39 and Galatians 5:19 the identifier is compounded.

⁴¹Rom 4:16; 5:14; 16:5b; I Cor 4:17a; II Cor 4:4; Gal 4:26; Phl 1:28. Cf. also Phl 3:19b.

⁴²II Cor 2:16a, 16b; Phl 3:19a, 19b. Cf. also Rom 4:16.

⁴³I Cor 1:30; 3:11; Phl 3:7.

7. Attributive Clauses

The attributive relative clauses, which also use forms of εἶναι and γίνεσθαι,⁴⁴ vary much more than the equative clauses. In the first place, the copula may be omitted and is indeed omitted in eighteen⁴⁵ out of the thirty attributive clauses. Second, there is much greater variety in the constituent slots filled by the relative. Third, a wider variety of forms of εἶναι are employed. Fourth, a wide range of descriptive constituents fill the role of attribute.⁴⁶

Attributive relative clauses possess at least four nuclear constituents: relative subject, copula and attribute. These are regularly arranged in the following order:

+r + COP:vcp + SBJ + ATT⁴⁷

⁴⁴Rom 16:7 is the only attributival relative clause which uses γίνεσθαι (γέγοναι) in the corpus.

⁴⁵Rom 2:29; 9:4b, 5a, 5b, 21a, 21b; 14:23; 16:27; I Cor 5:1; 7:7a, 7b; 8:6a, 6b; II Cor 8:18; 10:1; Gal 1:5; Phl 2:5; 4:3.

⁴⁶Descriptive--Rom 1:6, 25; 3:8; 16:7a; I Cor 13:9; II Cor 2:9; 10:1; Gal 1:6; 4:2ha.

Source--Rom 2:29; 9:5b; 14:23; I Cor 8:6a.

Location--Rom 8:34a; 16:7; I Cor 5:1; Phl 2:5; 4:3, 11.

Temporal--Rom 16:7, 27; Gal 1:5.

Possession--Rom 9:4, 5a; II Cor 8:18.

Purpose--Rom 9:21a, 21b.

Benefactor--Rom 16:27; Gal 1:5.

Manner--I Cor 7:7a, b; II Cor 11:15.

Agent--I Cor 8:6b; II Cor 8:18

Comparison--II Cor 11:15.

⁴⁷Emphasis (Rom 16:7a; II Cor 2:9) and speech habits (i.e. possessive accompanies substantive possessed

Because of the variations within the attributive relative clauses, each constituent must be discussed separately.

Only twelve attributive clauses have a verb. In eight of these the copula follows the relative immediately.⁴⁸ There is no evidence that the function of the relative affects this arrangement.⁴⁹ In all the instances save two⁵⁰ the attribute, whether represented by an adjective or by a prepositional phrase, follows the copula.

The subject is present in twenty-eight attributive clauses, either as the relative noun, or pronoun.⁵¹ When the subject is expressed and is not expressed by the relative, it always stands near the beginning of the clause. Only the copula is placed before it.⁵² Whenever the attribute

i.e. Rom 3:8; II Cor 8:18; 11:15. Cf. also Phl 3:19a, 19b; 4:3) probably explain all of these exceptions to this order.

⁴⁸The four exceptions are:

Rom 3:8 ὃν τὸ κρίμα ἐνδικόν ἐστιν.

Rom 16:7b οὗ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ.

II Cor 2:9 ἢ εἰς πάντα ὑπῆκοοί ἐστε.

II Cor 11:15 ὃν τὸ τέλος ἔσται κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν.

⁴⁹SBJ:r--Rom 1:25; 8:34a; 17:7a; I Cor 15:9; Gal 1:7; 4:24a. LOC:r--Rom 1:6; Phl 4:11. Perhaps the one exception is POS:r in Rom 3:8; II Cor 11:15.

⁵⁰Cf. Rom 3:8 and II Cor 2:9 in n. 48 above.

⁵¹SBJ:r--Rom 1:25; 8:34a, 9:21a, 21b; 14:23; 16:7a, 7b; I Cor 5:1; 7:7a, 7b; 15:9; II Cor 10:1; Gal 1:7; 4:24a; Phl 2:5.

SBJ:n/prn--Rom 1:6; 2:29; 3:8; 9:4; 5a, 5b; 16:27; I Cor 8:6a, 6b; II Cor 8:18; 11:15; Gal 1:5; Phl 4:3.

⁵²In Rom 3:8 and II Cor 11:15 the subject precedes the copula; in Rom 1:6 it follows the copula.

is represented by some construction other than the relative it regularly follows the subject.

All thirty clauses manifest an attribute constituent. It is represented by the relative five times, an adjective construction eight times, an adverb twice, and a prepositional phrase thirteen times.⁵³ In all of these, except Romans 3:8 and II Corinthians 11:15,⁵⁴ the attribute follows the copula. It always follows the subject.

The relative functioning as part of a noun phrase, i.e. possessive with a substantive, is more frequent among these clauses than elsewhere.⁵⁵ These are closely related to the equative clauses utilizing relative of possession⁵⁶ and to those attributive relative clauses in which a relative in the genitive of source.⁵⁷

⁵³ATT:r--Rom 16:27; I Cor 8:6a, 6b; Gal 1:5; Phl 4:11. ATT:adj/adjph--Rom 1:6, 25; 3:8; 16:7a; I Cor 15:9; II Cor 2:9; 10:1; Gal 1:7. ATT:adv--I Cor 7:7a, 7b. ATT:pph--Rom 2:29; 8:34a; 9:4, 5a, 5b, 21a, 21b; 14:23; 16:7; II Cor 8:18; 11:15; Phl 2:5; 4:3.

⁵⁴Cf. n. 48 above.

⁵⁵There are six examples in the Homologoumena: Rom 2:29; 3:8; II Cor 8:18; 11:15; Phl 3:19b; 4:3.

⁵⁶Phl 3:19a, 19b.

⁵⁷Rom 9:5b; perhaps also 9:4, 5a.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS, SECONDARY RESULTS, AND NEW DIRECTIONS

This dissertation set out to make a contribution to Pauline scholarship by the systematic examination of all of the examples of a particular linguistic phenomenon, the relative clause, in the thirteen letters of the Pauline Corpus. The goal of such a systematic analysis and description, a task never undertaken before in the study of the authorship of the epistles, was to present the evidence related to questions of authenticity which might result from such an analysis. It was not anticipated that such a study would settle the question of the authenticity of any given epistle. Nonetheless, it was believed that such a systematic critical examination would make a reliable contribution to the evidence already accumulated for or against the authenticity of each of the six Pauline Antilegomena.

That task is now complete. The relative clauses of the Pauline Corpus have been analyzed at each significant syntactical level-i.e. phrase-level (or the relative clause as a constituent in a substantival phrase), word-level (or the form, function and distribution of the relative words themselves), and clause-level (or the composition of the relative clause as a linguistic construction or sub-sentence). In the three preceding chapters that evidence has been systematically presented.

From this study has emerged (1) a number of firm conclusions relevant to the issue being examined, (2) several secondary results useful for Pauline studies, and (3) a number of indications of possible fruitful directions for future scholarship. To repeat these in detail would be unnecessarily redundant. At this point it is sufficient to summarize the general conclusions and secondary results of the study, noting both the value and the limitations of such results. The suggested directions for future study require greater development.

A. CONCLUSIONS

At every linguistic level the patterns of relative clause usage in the Antilegomena, both collectively and individually, differs markedly from the usage patterns of the Homologoumena. Thus the developing consensus against the authenticity of any of the Antilegomena finds support in this study.

It should be noted, however, that this study also modifies that consensus significantly. Current New Testament scholarship would arrange the Antilegomena according to the likelihood of authenticity (i.e. in their closeness to the Homologoumena) in the following order: Homologoumena-II Thessalonians-Colossians-Ephesians-II Timothy-I Timothy-Titus. This study has shown that the Pastoral epistles are usually closer to the Homologoumena in the variety of language patterns employed than are Colossians and Ephesians.

It has also shown, I think conclusively, (1) that Ephesians is usually closer in style to the Homologoumena than is Colossians, and (2) that these two epistles tend to be related to the style of the Homologoumena as they are not related to each other and to be related to each other as they are not related to the Homologoumena. These modifications in the consensus are very important.

The force of these conclusions has been greatly strengthened by nature of the material studied and by the regularity with which the same conclusions emerged at different levels and from different types of evidence. (1) Consistent usage patterns at each level emerged, although in most cases the choice of a relative clause to express the idea must have been an unconscious act by the author. (2) While it was not possible at every point to analyze the range of usage in the Homologoumena, at those points where the range could be shown statistically, not one of the Antilegomena was found with any regularity within the ranges of variation within the Homologoumena. (3) Many characteristic Pauline idioms and style traits are not found in any of the Antilegomena and, in fact, contrasting idioms are often found there. (4) On the other hand, certain frequent characteristic Pauline patterns and idioms have almost become rules of style in certain of the Antilegomena. Thus, they seem to be more Pauline than Paul. (5) In overall effect, the use of relative clauses at every syntactical level seems more wooden in most of the Antilegomena

than in any of the Homologoumena.

B. SECONDARY RESULTS

In the Introduction it was anticipated that such a study as this might produce, as by-products, certain secondary results which would be useful in Pauline studies. This has become the case. A complete list of all these results, especially those having to do with the exegesis of particular passages, would be too long to repeat here. Nonetheless, the more important secondary results should be noted.

1. Style Description

Important progress has been in an analytical description of the style of the Homologoumena and of each of the Antilegomena. The degree of progress varies from epistle to epistle. For example, because relative clauses are key to the style of both Ephesians and Colossians, this study can justifiably claim to be the first systematic portrayal of the styles of these two epistles. For all of the other Homologoumena and Antilegomena significant advances in describing characteristic style patterns has been made.

2. One, Two, or Three Relatives?

Certain questions on the use of relative clauses in Paul, which have been debated heretofore, can now be regarded as settled. Among such matters in the use of ὅστις. It is now clear that ὅς/ὅστις is a single relative in the Homologoumena (and probably also in the Antilegomena) with ὅστις supplying the nominative forms in which ὅς differs

from the definite article only in accent. "Οσοι, -αι, -α has simply replaced πάντες οἱ/οἵτινες/ὅσοι in our Corpus. Also the substantival relative clauses do not presuppose the demonstrative pronoun οὗτος in the following head clause. Emphasis seems to affect sentence order only by moving the emphasized constituent to the beginning of the sentence or clause.

3. Close Relationship Between Form and Function

At every linguistic level, but especially at a clause-level, this study demonstrates that there is a closer relationship between form and function than had been expected or indicated in previous studies of word-order. The order of constituents (e.g. substantival vs. adjectival relative clauses; predicates, personal pronouns, actors, undergoers, and other nuclear constituents) is much more consistent and related to meaning than has been heretofore noted. It was especially in this area that both Colossians and Ephesians seemed to take Pauline style traits and to make them invariable rules of style. The regularity of these patterns at each level led to other important secondary results.

4. Biblical Greek

Given the great regularity in the constituent order both within the relative clauses and between the relative clauses and the head clause, several matters of significance to the history of the Greek language emerge: (a) the Pauline order both in its arrangement and regularity is much closer to later Greek than to the earlier freedom;

(b)wherever Paul's order of constituents differs consistently from the usual Greek constituent orders, his order conforms to the usual Semitic constituent orders; (c)these facts, coupled with the absence of any indications of a translation Greek, support Turner's, Wifstrand's and Beyer's claim that there did exist a type of Biblical Greek shaped by the Septuagint and the liturgy of the Hellenistic synagogue.

5. Traditional Materials

The very consistency of constituent orders at every level contributed both positively and negatively to the identification of alleged traditional materials in the Corpus: (a)Philippians 2:6-8 and I Timothy 3:16 have been shown to be at variance with the style of their contexts at all three linguistic levels; this would support the identification of these clauses as foreign elements in their contexts, perhaps introduced from the hymnic tradition of the church. (b)Colossians 1:12-14 and 1:15-20 on one hand and Ephesians 1:3-14 and 2:14-18 on the other are thoroughly consistent with their particular contexts at each linguistic level. This consistency in style between context and alleged hymnic fragment, especially when coupled with the regimented consistency of the styles of each of the two epistles and the striking contrast in styles between the two epistles, raises serious questions about the attempts to identify any one of the passages as hymnic. (c)The criteria of inconsistency in style also contributed

to the tentative identification of several tradition-shaped formulae in the Corpus.

C. NEW DIRECTIONS

By what it has been both able to do and unable to do, this study has indicated possible fruitful directions for future critical studies of the language of Paul, his school and the early church. At least four issues deserve mention and fifth deserves more extended development.

1. Form and Function Studies of New Testament Language

This study has shown that there is a direct connection between form and function at every linguistic level in the Pauline relative clauses, as well as (2) regular arrangements of clause-level constituents, (3) following usually what might be characterized as Semitic constituent orders. The nature and persistence of this evidence suggests that similar studies of other clause types, as well as of participial and infinitival phrases, would be useful in the description of Pauline style and syntax, in the determination of questions of authorship, and in the attempts to describe the language context of early Christianity.

2. Hymnic Style and Traditional Fragments

This study argues against attempts to find fragments of early Christian hymns in Ephesians 1:3-14, 2:14-18, and Colossians 1:12-14 and 15-20. It also demonstrated that there was good evidence to indicate the imprint of other traditional ecclesiastical and polemical formulations on

many other relative clauses in the Corpus. Both matters must be regarded as far from settled. Although there is an abundance of essays and monographs analyzing and reconstructing the alleged hymns in Philippians, Colossians, Ephesians, and I Timothy, there is as yet no known thorough analysis of the language and style of the Hellenistic-Jewish and early Christian hymns. Eduard Norden's Agnostos Theos, which was little more than a suggestive introduction, is still the standard work in this area. Without such studies, attempts to identify hymnic fragments in the New Testament will always be highly subjective.

3. Pseudonymity and Style

It was pointed out above and has been noted in every chapter of this study that at times the Antilegomena, especially Colossians and Ephesians, seem to be more Pauline than Paul. That is, they appear to take a characteristic Pauline idiom or style trait and use it as a dominating rule of style. One finds the same phenomenon in the uses of substantival relative clauses and substantival participles in the Gospel of John and I John. Is such a redundant employment of characteristic-traits and idioms of an earlier author a common characteristic of pseudonymous writers, especially when they belong to a school? If it could be shown that this is the case in the Graeco-Roman world, scholars would have a useful key for the identification of pseudonymous materials.

4. Epistolary Uses of Relative Clauses

In Chapter I and in Excursus II it was noted that Ephesians 6:21-22 was different in style from any other relative clause construction in that epistle. These verses have closer Colossian parallels (4:7-8) than any other verses in Ephesians.

However, noting the Colossian parallels does not settle the matter, because Ephesians 6:21-22 and Colossians 4:7-8 are obviously similar in form and usage to I Corinthians 4:17; 16:3; Philippians 2:19-23, and II Corinthians 8:18, 22, to name only the Pauline parallels containing relative clauses. All of these passages have to do with the sending and introduction of messengers or representatives. That is, all serve basic epistolary functions.

The heavy use of appositives, parallel adjectival phrases and clauses, and purpose constructions coupled with the use of *πέμπω* or its equivalent are characteristic of these constructions and their other parallels. Most of the same characteristics are found with *ἀσπάζομαι* in Romans 16:1-16 and with *παρακαλῶ* in Philemon 8-15. That all of these occur in what should be called epistolary contexts raises the question of special epistolary uses of relative clauses.

A beginning has been made in the study of the epistolary uses of relative clauses by Professor Robert

Funk.¹ Perhaps his students and the Pauline Seminar of the Society of Biblical Literature will go beyond this beginning in their analysis of epistolary forms. Nonetheless, these passages indicate that study of the relative clauses in the epistles of the Graeco-Roman world might be productive for the understanding of many passages in the Pauline epistles.

D. RELATIVE CLAUSES AND PAUL'S ARGUMENTATIVE STYLE

Among the more important and impressive results of this dissertation is the way in which the analysis of the use of relative clauses made it possible to complete a comprehensive and cohesive characterization of the contrasting styles of Colossians and Ephesians. This was possible, of course, because the adjectival use of relative clauses in both epistles is characteristic of the style of each as a whole. In contrast no such comprehensive and cohesive characterization of the style of the Homologoumena has been forthcoming. In part, this is a result of the facts that relative clauses do not play as a prominent role in the Pauline Homologoumena and that the recognition of Paul's fondness for substantival relative clauses does not immediately provide a key to the characterization of Paul's style.

Thus the work here presented makes clear the need

¹ Funk, Robert, "The Apostolic Parousia: Form and Significance," Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to Joan Knox, (Cambridge, 1967).

for a more systematic examination of the sentences and of each of the sentence-level constituents which are common to the Pauline Corpus. This author believes that only by such an analysis can the authenticity of II Thesalonians, Colossians, and Ephesians be settled. It is to suggestions as to how it might reflect on questions of authenticity that the remainder of this chapter is devoted.

1. Paul's Style Characterized

While there are many variations and interludes in Pauline style, it seems to me that the most obvious characteristic of Pauline style---and that which most frequently distinguishes the Antilegomena from the Homologoumena---is Paul's penchant for cause-effect argumentation. This manifests itself in many different ways: (1) frequent conditional protases followed by resulting apodoses; (2) frequent sentences containing causal or result subordinate clauses; (3) the fondness for inferential and causal particles at the beginning of sentences; (4) the heavy use of anarthrous or adverbial participles. While this generalization is too broad to prove at this point, it does receive considerable support from a comparison of the use of particles and connectives both within the Pauline Corpus and in the remainder of the New Testament. (1) The Homologoumena makes much heavier use of the argumentative or cause-effect connectives (e.g. *ἐάν, εἰ, γάρ, ὅτι, ἔπει, διό, ἵνα, ὥπως*) than of the circumstantial connectives (e.g. *ὅτε, ὅταν ἕως, ὅπου*). (2) The use of such argumentative connectives is distributed proportionately throughout the Homologoumena.

(3)The ratios of such argumentative connectives per page is much greater in the Pauline Homologoumena than in any other New Testament writer and (4)than it is in any of the Antilegomena. The evidence for these assertions is easily obtained from a concordance or a book of vocabulary statistics. (5)It also receives support from the argumentative use to which Paul puts many, if not most of the relative clauses in the Homologoumena.

Assuming for the moment that this characterization of Pauline style is correct, how does it relate to the study of Paul's relative clauses and to the authenticity of the Antilegomena? The alleged cause-effect style seems to have a considerable relationship to both questions.

2. The Argumentative Use of Relative Clauses

Although there has been some debate over identifying certain relative clauses (an adjectival construction) as adverbial in force,² and although no clear-cut criteria have been developed as yet which would put such identifications on an objective linguistic basis, some relative clauses must have been used adverbially in Greek and are so used in Paul. This is clear from the facts that (1)most adverbial subordinate clauses and (2)most hypotactic clause connectives in Greek have evolved from relative clauses and relative words. (3)The process of

²
Cf. e.g. A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research, (Nashville, 1934), p. 956.

the most hypotactic clause connectives in Greek have evolved from relative clauses and relative words.

(3) The process of the evolution of adverbial clauses from relative clauses is evidently continuing in the Pauline Corpus.³

When one asks how the ideas of each relative is related to the idea in the head clause, one discovers that at least 32 of the 275 relative clauses in the Homologoumena function adverbially in their contexts. Thirteen of these were discussed as adverbial relative clauses in Chapter I⁴ because their introductory relative phrases had been reduced to subordinating connectives. The remainder must be identified by other means (yet to be adequately delineated and described).

Of these 128 relative clauses functioning adverbially, thirty-one serve functions which should be characterized as circumstantial.⁵ But the most striking facts are that (1) no fewer than 101 of the 275 relative

³ Cf. the use of ἐφ' ᾧ as a relative in Rom 6:21; 14:21; II Cor 11:12b, 21; and as a subordinating connective in Rom 5:12; II Cor 5:4; Phil 3:12; ἐν ᾧ as a relative in Rom 8:15; I Cor 7:24; 15:1c; Col 2:3 and as a connective in Rom 2:1 and 8:3; and εἰς ᾧ as a relative in I Cor 10:11; II Cor 1:10b and as a connective in II Th 1:11 and 2:14.

⁴ Pp. 47-49.

⁵ Temporal: Rom 2:16; 7:1; 11:13, 25; I Cor 7:39; 11:26; 15:25; Gal 4:1, 19b. Focal: I Cor 7:20, 24; II Cor 11:12b; Phil 4:11. Cause: Rom 15:18; II Cor 2:3; 12:17. Comparison: Rom 12:3; I Cor 4:6; 10:13b; II Cor 1:13; 5:10; 12:6; Gal 1:8, 9; Phm 21. Reference or Specification: Rom 7:6; I Cor 7:1; 17:37; Gal 1:20. Instrument: Rom 2:1; 14:22.

clauses of the Homologoumena serve logical or argumentative functions (i.e. condition, concession, consequence, cause), (2) this penchant for argumentative relative clauses is closely related to the propensity for substantival relative clauses, and (3) these clauses are evenly distributed both in the various epistles of the Homologoumena and in the various types of material.

Condition is the most frequent and easily identified⁶ argumentative function served by Pauline relative

6 Several factors make it possible to identify conditional relative clauses with reasonable certainty: (1) Most or all of the clauses of certain types are conditional: For example, all of the Pauline ὅσοι clauses, except those introduced by ἐφ' ὅσον and most of those containing the conditional particles (ἄν or ἐάν).

Second, the linear arrangement supports the identification of these clauses as conditional relative clauses. The placing of the protasis before the apodosis in Pauline conditional sentences is so invariable that one can safely call it a rule of Pauline style. As the illustrations above show, the same is also true in the Pauline relative clauses identified as conditional; the relative protasis regularly precedes the apodosis. Beyer has also called attention to this tendency of putting the relative clause (the protasis) first in all Semitic languages: Klaus Beyer, Semitische Syntax in Neuen Testament, 2nd ed. Vol I: Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments (Göttingen, 1968) pp. 142-143 and passim.

Third, many of the alleged conditional relative clauses are co-ordinated with conditional clauses; others occur in contexts which contain parallel conditional sentences. For example, the six ὅσοι clauses in Philemon 4:8 is continued by two other protases introduced by εἰ τις. This construction is then coordinated with a ὅς clause in 4:9. Philemon 3:15-16 contains three coordinated clauses introduced successively by ὅσαυ, καὶ εἰ τις, and πλὴν εἰς ὅ. I Corinthians 7:13 provides an indisputable coordination of εἰ τις... ἔχει and ἥ τις ἔχει. There are many striking examples of these phenomena in the Homologoumena. Cf. e.g. Rom 6:2, 3 (cf. vs. 5); 8:14 (cf. vs. 12-13); 8:24 (cf. vs. 25); 8:29, 30a, 30b, 30c (cf. vs. 31); I Cor 7:36; II Cor 11:21 (cf. vs. 20); Gal 3:27 (cf. vs. 29); 5:14 (cf. vs. 2).

clauses. No less than thirty-three⁷ of the Pauline relative clauses are conditional in force. Most of these are substantial relative clauses. A typical example of a relative clause which states a condition for the head clause is

Romans 8:24

ὃ γὰρ βλέπει τις,
τί καὶ ἐλπίζει;

Concession is manifested by at least nineteen⁸ relative clauses in the Homologoumena of which the following are typical examples:

⁷ Rom 2:12a, 12b (ὅσοις); 3:19 (ὅσοις); 6:2 (ὅστις), 3 (ὅσοις); 8:14 (ὅσοις), 24; 14; 5a, 5b, 21, 23 (πάν ὃ); 15:4 (ὅσοις); I Cor 7:13 (ὅστις), 37; 11:27 (ὃς ἄν); II Cor 1:20 (ὅσοις); 11:21; Gal 3:10 (ὅσοις), 27 (ὅσοις); 5:4 (ὅστις); 6:7 (ὃς ἄν), 12 (ὅσοις), 16 (ὅσοις); Phl 3:15, 16; 4:8a, 8b, 8c, 8d, 8e, 8f (ὅσοις), 9.

It seems quite probable that the following should be added to this list: Rom 4:21; 8:31; I Cor 6:18 (ὃς ἄν); 7:24, 36, 39; 10:20; 12:23; 16:3 (ὃς ἄν); II Cor 11:12a, 12b, 21 (ὃς ἄν); Phl 4:11.

⁸ Rom 2:23; 7:15b, 15c, 16, 19a, 19b, 20; 8:25; 10:14a, 14b; 11:7; I Cor 10:30; 15:15; Gal 1:7; 2:18; 3:1; 5:17; Phl 3:7 (ὅστις); 4:10.

The following nine relative clauses should possibly be among the examples of concessive relative clauses in the Pauline Homologoumena: Rom 1:25b; 15:18; I Cor 4:7; II Cor 11:4a, 4b, 4c; Gal 1:23; 2:4b; 4:9.

While concessive relative clauses are more common in personal and narrative materials (e.g. Rom 7:15b, 15c, 16, 19a, 19b, 20; 8:25; 10:14a, 14b; 11:7; I Cor 10:30; I Cor 11:4a (?), 4b, (?), 4c (?); Gal 1:7 (?); Phl 3:7; 4:10) than elsewhere in the Homologoumena, they are also found in didactic and paraenetic sections as well. (E.g. Rom 1:25b; 2:23; 8:25; 10:14a, 14b; 11:7; I Cor 4:7; 10:30; 15:15; Gal 1:23; 3:1; 4:9; 5:17 among others). It is also probable that concessive relative clauses are found in each of the Homologoumena except I Thessalonians and Philemon.

I Corinthians 15:15

ὅτι ἡμαρτυρήσαμεν...ὅτι ἡγείρεν τὸν Χριστόν,

ὃν οὐκ ἡγείρεν εἴπερ ἄρα νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται.

Romans 11:17

ὁ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραὴλ,

τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπέτυχεν.

While the characteristics which identify the concessive relative clauses are not as clear as those which identify conditional relative clauses, the identification can still be made with relative certainty.⁹

⁹

A. T. Robertson (Op. cit., p. 1026) has asserted that concessive relative clauses are simply a form of conditional relative clauses, this may be the case in Greek generally. However, the concessive relative clauses in the Pauline Homologoumena, often follow rather than precede the head construction (e.g. Rom 1:25b; 10:14a, 14b; 15:18; I Cor 4:7; 10:30; 15:15; II Cor 11:4a, 14b; 15:18; 2:4a; 3:1; 4:9; Phil 4:10). (2) when the concessive relative clause does precede the head clause, the relative clause is regularly resumed by a demonstrative pronoun in the head construction (Rom 2:23; 7:19; 8:25 are the only exceptions). (3) Concessive relative clauses either contain a negative (e.g. Rom 7:15c, 16, 19b, 20, 8:25; 10:14a, 14b; 15:18; I Cor 4:7; 15:15; II Cor 11:4a, 4b, 4c; Gal 1:7), are themselves negated (e.g., Rom 7:15b, 19a; Gal 5:17), or else contain a predicate which contrasts with the head clause predicate (e.g. Rom 1:25b; 2:23; 7:15c; 8:25; I Cor 4:7; 10:30; Gal 1:23; 2:18; 3:1; 4:9; 5:17; Phil 3:7). (4) The predicates of concessive relative clauses regularly, but not invariably, precede the time of the predicate of the head clause (e.g. Rom 7:15b, 15c, 16, 19a, 19b, 20; 10:14a, 14b; 11:7; 15:18; I Cor 4:7; 10:30; II Cor 11:4a, 4b, 4c; Gal 1:23; 2:4a (?); 18; 3:1; Phil 3:7; 4:10).

Furthermore, three of the Pauline concessive relative clauses (Rom 10:14a, 14b; Gal 7) are coordinated with or paralleled by equivalent concessive constructions.

Consequence, either simple result or purpose, is shown by at least seventeen relative clauses¹⁰ in the Homologoumena. A typical Pauline example is found in

I Corinthians 6:5

οὕτως οὐκ ἔνα ἐν ὑμῖν οὐδεὶς σόφος,

ὃς δυνήσεται διακρίναι ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ
ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ;

Consequential relative clauses regularly come at the right end of the sentence in which they occur. Many, but not all, contain a future tense predicate.¹¹ The Pauline examples frequently refer to the Eschaton.¹² In some cases they designate the result which may be expected from a quality or attribute of the head.¹³

Cause is at present more difficult to iden-

¹⁰

Rom 3:30; 6:21, 8:15; 9:21a, 21b; I Cor 1:8, 9; 4:5, 17b; 6:5; 11:21a, 21b; II Cor 9:11; Phl 2:20; 3:8, 21; I Th 5:24.

Among other possible examples of consequential relative clauses should be Rom 1:5; 2:6; 3:8; 9:24; II Cor 3:6; Gal 2:5; I Th 2:13.

¹¹Examples of this type are found in: 2:6; 3:30; I Cor 1:8; 4:5, 17b; 6:5; Phl 2:20; 3:8, 21; I Th 5:24.

¹²Examples of this type are found in: Rom 2:6; 3:30; I Cor 1:8; 4:5; Phl 3:21.

¹³Rom 3:30; I Cor 1:9; 6:5; 8:6a, 6b; Phl 2:20 and I Th 5:24 are the examples of this construction in the Pauline Homologoumena.

tify objectively in the Pauline relative clauses.¹⁴ Nonetheless, it is probable that at least thirty-two of the clauses of the homologoumena serve causal functions in their contexts.¹⁵ Although the causal force of some of them is indicated by the form of the relative,¹⁶ the majority are like

¹⁴ Causal relative clauses do not manifest the clear structural patterns, such as are found in the initial conditional relative clauses. Like most subordinate clauses of any type (except temporal and conditional clauses), these relative clauses appear near the end of the sentence. Frequently, but not always, the relative clause predicate antedates the head clause predicate. An analytic study of Paul's use of causal constructions must be made before we can be more precise in either identification or description.

There are also few examples of other indications of adverbial function. II Corinthians 8:18, 22 are roughly parallel to the *ὅτι* clause in vs. 17. The *διὰ τοῦτο* which introduces the next sentence establishes the *ὅτι* clause in Romans 1:25 as causal. The use of *οὖν* as a connective in the next sentence shows that the relative clause in Romans 4:25 is causal relative clauses which come at the end of a list of successive causal statements.

¹⁵ Rom 1:25 (*ὅτι*), 32 (*ὅτι*); 2:15 (*ὅτι*); 4:17, 18, 24; 5:2a, 11, 12; 6:16b; 8:3, 32 (*ὅτι*); 14:15; I Cor 1:30; 4:17a; 10:11; 15:9; II Cor 1:10a, 10b; 3:14 (*ὅτι*); 4:4a; 5:4; 9:2; 10:1; 13:3, 10; Gal 6:14; Phl 3:12; 4:3; Phm 10, 12, 13.

In addition it seems highly possible that the following twenty are causal also: Rom 3:25; 4:25; 8:34b; 9:4 (*ὅτι*), 4, 5a, 5b; 16:4a (*ὅτι*), 4b, 5b, 6, 7a (*ὅτι*). 7, 12; I Cor 2:7, 8; II Cor 8:10 (*ὅτι*), 18, 22; 10:8; Gal 2:4 (*ὅτι*).

¹⁶ Cf. Chapt. I, pp. 47-48. Rom 5:12; 8:3; II Cor 5:4; Phl 3:12.

Galatians 6:14

ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι

εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται καὶ γὰρ κοσμῷ.

that is, they are relative clauses standing in normal syntactical relationship to the remainder of the head construction.

Such an analysis as that suggested above is beyond the scope of this dissertation, requiring, as it does, extended studies of the form of all Pauline conditional, concessive, consequential, and causal constituents. Nonetheless, this limited survey would indicate that a substantial number of the Pauline relative clauses stand in such logical relationships with their contexts. Given the basic descriptive function which relative clauses fill syntactically, the large number which serve logical functions lends strong support to the characterization of the dominant Pauline style as logical or argumentative, i.e. reasoning from cause to effect. Added support for this contention is obtained from the fact that this use of relative clauses is shown to have a definite relationship both to the tendencies of Biblical Greek and to Paul's proven fondness for introductory substantival relative clauses.

3. Argumentative Relative Clauses and Authenticity

Not only would a thorough analysis of Paul's

style assist in the understanding of certain Pauline passages, but it would provide more reliable information on the problem of the authenticity of the Antilegomena. The remaining pages of this chapter will indicate how that is the case, even when the program has been as limited and sketchy as the foregoing.

Table XI on the following page shows the distribution in the Pauline Corpus of the relative clauses which are used with marked adverbial force in their contexts. An initial examination of this table does not appear to indicate as much contrast between the Homologoumena and the Antilegomena as we have come to expect, but a more careful examination will make clear that the same contrasts are still there. All relative clauses which function adverbially, and especially those which serve logical functions, are well distributed and occur in a variety of idioms throughout the Homologoumena.¹⁷ On the other hand, the Antilegomena, both

17

First, the ratios of all adverbial relative clauses (45% and 67%) are remarkably consistent in each of the epistles. Only the three smaller epistles vary significantly. The larger proportions in Philipians are accounted for by the seven relative clauses in 4:8ff., a phenomenon that would not affect the ratio significantly if the epistle was larger (or had more relative clauses) but does affect the ratios in a shorter epistle. As always, the number of relative clauses in I Thesalonians and Philemon are too few for significant comparison.

Second, the frequency and consistency with which Paul utilized the relative clause logically is especially important for describing Paul's style. Over one-third (97/275) (and probably over one-half or 150/275) of the relative clauses in the Homologoumena are used in a cause-effect argument. The only variations in these ratios are in the three epistles discussed above and in Romans where, as we would expect from the purpose of the epistle, the ratio of logical usage is greater than for the Homologoumena as a whole.

individually and collectively,¹⁸ contrast with the distribution and idiom patterns of the Homologoumena.

As we have come to expect, the Pastoral Epistles are closer to the Homologoumena in ratio of relative clauses used adverbially, in the number of Pauline idioms so utilized, and in the variety of relative clause idioms so employed. In this case, this is especially true of I Timothy, an epistle which also seems to argue from cause to effect. The conditional clause in I Timothy 6:1 and the concessive clause in I Timothy 4:3 are regular Pauline

Third, a survey of Table X and of the particularities of distribution shows that the adverbial use of relative clauses is not limited to any particular types of material. Relative clauses are used adverbially in doctrinal, paraenetic, epistolary, traditional/liturgical, keygmatic and personal materials.

¹⁸First, adverbial relative clauses occur much less frequently in the Antilegomena; only forty-four relative clauses in the Antilegomena are clearly adverbial. Second, an even smaller proportion of the relative clauses in the Antilegomena are used for those adverbial functions which we have designated as circumstantial. Third, the overwhelming majority of the relative clauses which function adverbially in the Antilegomena are used to show cause or consequence: only three are conditional.

Furthermore, with regard to the contrasting idioms of the Antilegomena, one notes that (4) the structural indicators of the adverbial functions and (5) the types of contexts in which such adverbial relative clauses are found are generally more limited in the Antilegomena than they are in the Homologoumena. (6) These structural indicators in the Antilegomena often contrast with the indicators of the same function in the Homologoumena. (7) The almost total absence of concessive relative clauses (I Timothy 4:3 is the single possible exception) from the Antilegomena is a most striking contrast. (8) The relative absence of conditional relative clauses in the epistles which are often more devoted to paraenesis and exhortation is also noteworthy.

idioms. The causal clauses of I Timothy are similar to the Pauline counterparts, but they also share marked internal traits which distinguish them from the Pauline parallels.¹⁹ In contrast, the three consequential clauses have none of the marks of such clauses in the Homologoumena.²⁰ In spite of the similarities in proportion and usage, the content and issues discussed in these clauses, their lengthy and ponderous character, and the notable differences in idiom still argue strongly against the authenticity of I Timothy.

Given the appositional style of Colossians and the consistency with which the relative clauses of Colossians match the style of that epistle, one does not expect relative clauses to be used argumentatively here. Nonetheless, at least ten are so used. Each of the two conditional clauses (3:17, 23) contain *ἐάν* and follow the usual Pauline patterns.

¹⁹

1:4, 6, 19; 2:4; 6:15, 21 are clearly causal. It seems likely that 3:15; 4:10, 14; 6:10, 12 should be so identified.

These eleven clauses are similar in several ways: (1) They each follow the head clause; (2) They each justify a command (either negatively or positively) concerning the conduct or content of the ministry of the recipient; (3) Each either refers to the errors of the heretics or the divine acts of grace to the addressee or else to all men. (4) In most the predicate of the relative clause is anterior in time to the head clause.

²⁰ 1:20b; 6:4, 9. None of them show purpose or intent; and none use the future tense or the subjunctive mood. All of them are pure result clauses, having the standard paraphrase of either "which result in ..." or "the result of which is that ...".

TABLE XI
ADVERBIAL FUNCTIONS OF RELATIVE CLAUSES

	Condition	Concession	Consequence	Cause	LOGICAL TOTALS	Time	Location	Source	Comparison	Reference	Instrument	GRAND TOTALS
Rom	13	11	5	13	42	4		1	1	1	2	51
I Cor	3	2	7	4	16	3	2		2	2		25
II Cor	2		1	9	12		1	2	3			18
Gal	6	4		1	11	2			2	1		16
Phl	9	2	3	2	16		1					17
I Th			1		1							1
Phm				3	3				1			4
II Th			1	1	2							2
Col	2			8	10	2						12
Eph			6	4	10				1			11
I Tm	1	1	3	6	11				1			12
II Tm			4	1	5		1		1			7
Tit			2	2	4							4

The eight causal relative clauses²¹ in Colossians are a sub-type of the regular pattern of all the exhortations, both doctrinal and paraenetic, which appear in the epistle. It is characteristic of the style of this writer that he almost always follows an imperative with a clause of justification usually causal in force. The first imperative in the epistle will serve as a good model:

Colossians 2:8-12

βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν...κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν·

ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα...

Here the clause of causal justification is connected to the imperative by ὅτι, but elsewhere a variety of argumentative constructions are employed.²²

A typical example of a causal relative clause in this pattern is found in

²¹

Col 2:17, 22, 23; 3:5, 6, 14, 15; 4:17. The relative clauses in 1:13, 27, and 2:3 may be causal also. However, the appositional character of the argument (esp. in ch. 1) makes it impossible to decide with certainty.

²²

Among the causal constructions which, in addition to relative clauses, are employed are causal participles (3:9, 17, 22, 24; 4:1) and several causal clauses introduced by γάρ (3:3, 20, 15). The condition in 3:1; the comparative clauses in 2:6; 3:12-13, and 3:18; and the purposive constructions in 3:21 (ἵνα clause); 4:2-4 (ἵνα clause); 4:5 (purposive participle); 4:6 (infinitive) and 4:16 (ἵνα clause) are similar argumentative justifications for the commands. 2:18 introduces a crucial and problematic passage dealing with the Colossian heresy; even here (2:19) the relative clause may be causally related to the prohibition.

The only imperatives which have no such justifying clauses are εὐχαρίστοι γίνεσθε (3:15), ἀγαπᾶτε...καὶ μὴ πικραίνεσθε (3:19), ἀσπάσασθε (4:15), μνημονεύετε (4:18).

Colossians 3:14

ἐπὶ πᾶσιν δὲ τούτοις τὴν ἀγάπην (ἐνδύσασθε)

ὅ ἐστιν σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος.

All of the examples have an imperative in the head clause²³ followed by a relative clause which justifies the command or prohibition. It is important to note that most of the relative clauses follow the pattern of justifying the demand by commenting on the nature either of the act demanded or its undergoer.²⁴

There are clauses appended to commands in the Homologoumena which seek to justify the demand casually. However, the pattern is never as consistent there as it is in Colossians. A few of the relative clauses are so employed, especially in the Roman epistle,²⁵ but even there both the consistent pattern and emphasis on the nature of the act (or its undergoer) is missing.²⁶

Given the penchant for successive subordination

²³ Τί...δογματίζεσθε in 2:20 implies the prohibition μὴ δογματίζεσθε.

²⁴ E.g. 3:6--"put to death courteousness because covetousness is idolatry"; 3:7--"put to death a variety of vices because these vices are wrath-begetting"; 2:22-23--"do not be enslaved to certain old legal requirements because these things are all perishable and are not of value"; 4:17 "take heed to the ministry because it is given of the Lord."; etc.

²⁵ Rom. 14:15; 16:4a, 4b, 5b, 7a, 7b, 12. Perhaps Rom 5:2, 11; 14:5a, 5b, should be included in this group.

²⁶ E.g. Rom 16:5b, 7a, 7b are the only clauses containing copular verbs among the examples from the Homologoumena. Even these imply dynamic rather than qualitative causes.

in Ephesians, one would expect the relative clauses of that epistle to be used argumentatively. This, in fact, is the case. However, it is unusually difficult to determine the argumentative force of specific relative clauses in Ephesians, as it is for all types of constructions there. The indications of the logical function of the relative clauses in this epistle are the recognized style traits of the epistle, and not any similarity with Pauline idioms.

For example, here are at least four relative clauses which function causally in Ephesians.²⁷ A typical example is found in

Ephesians 5:18

μη μεθύσκεσθε οἶνῳ,
ἐν ᾧ ἔστιν ἁσωτία.

The characteristic which makes it possible to ascertain with certainty the causal function in these examples is not the structure of this sentence, but the consistency of the author's style. As was noted in Excursus II, the author of Ephesians regularly includes such a justification for each command or prohibition, either in the form of a comparative clause (stating a model) or a causal clause.²⁸ The relative clauses in Ephesians 4:30 and 5:4, 5, 18 are mani-

²⁷ Eph. 4:30; 5:4, 5, 18 are like the example above. They also resemble the relative clauses attached to the imperatives in Colossians. Cf. pp. 327-8 above.

It seems likely that the relative clause in 2:2 is also causal, explaining why the addresses were once dead. However, the precise logical function of this relative clause is more difficult to determine.

²⁸ Excursus II, p. 106 and notes 11, 12.

festations of this style trait.

One can with some certainty identify six relative clauses²⁹ in Ephesians as consequential in force on the basis of known characteristics of Ephesian style. In Excursus II it was noted that the writer regularly ended periods (and even semi-periods) with telic constructions.³⁰ That final construction is a relative clause in these six cases, of which the most obvious example is

Ephesians 6:16

ἐν πᾶσιν ἀναλαβόντες τον θυρεον τῆς πίστεως
ἐν ᾧ δυνήσεσθε πάντα τα βέλη τοῦ πονηροῦ τα
περύρωμένα σβέσαι.

Thus, in spite of the limits of this presentation, it is possible to see that a comprehensive description of the style of the Homologoumena which would include showing how the different construction types are related to the total style, would not only enhance the understanding of many Pauline passages, but would also assist in settling the questions concerning the authenticity of the Antilegomena.

²⁹

Eph. 1:7; 2:21, 22; 3:4; 4:16; 6:16.

³⁰

Excursus II, pp. 110-111.

³¹

In addition to the fact that these six relative clauses end their periods, they possess several other structural indicators of their consequential force. In each of them the predicate of the relative clause is in present or future tense (most relative clause predicates in Ephesians are past in time) and is sequential to the predicate of the head construction. Furthermore, the use of forms of δύναμαι in 3:4 and 6:16 indicate the telic character of these constructions.

APPENDIX I

ADJECTIVAL RELATIVE CLAUSES (Classified According to the Attributival Position)

1a. Articular Head With More Than One Attributive

Rom 1:6	Adjective (πᾶσιν) before head
Rom 1:25	Head is substantival participle
Rom 9:4-5	Appositive plus four relative clauses
I Cor 2:13	Head is a substantival participle phrase
I Cor 3:11	Head is a substantival participle
I Cor 6:19	Adjective and Prepositional phrase before Head
I Cor 15:1	<u>Four</u> relative clauses
I Cor 15:31	Adjective before Head
II Cor 1:6	Adjective (αὐτός) before Head
II Cor 3:14	Adjective before Head
II Cor 4:4a	Head is Substantival Participle
Gal 2:4-5	Adjective before Head and <u>two</u> relative clauses
Gal 4:9	Co-ordinate adjective before Head
Gal 4:26	Attributive adverb before Head
Gal 5:10	Head is a substantival participle
Gal 5:19-21 ¹	Two relative Clauses
I Thes 1:10	Relative Clause + Attributival Participle phrase
I Thes 5:24	Head is a substantival Participle

¹This example depends on whether the antecedent of & is τὰ ἔργα or the vice list in the ἵνα clause.

- II Thes 1:4 Relative clause followed by appositive
- II Thes 1:9 Head is co-ordinate substantival partic.
- II Thes 2:8-9 Head is substantival adjective
 two relative clauses
- Eph 1:7-13 Head is substantival Participle
 three relative clauses
- Eph 1:14 Attributive adjective after head
- Eph 2:4 Attributive adjective before head
- Eph 4:30 Attributive adjective after head
- Col 1:5b Attributive participial phrase after head
- Col 1:13 Attributival Participial phrase after head
- Col 1:14-18 Three relative clauses
- Col 1:23 In order: Relative clause
 Participial phrase
 Relative clause
- Col 1:24-25 Two relative clauses
- Col 1:27a Substantival adjective is head
- Col 1:27b-28 Two Relative Clauses
- Col 2:14 Attributive phrase before head
- Col 3:6-7 Five appositives
 Two relative clauses²
- I Tim 3:16 Attributival Genitive before Head³
- I Tim 4:6 Adjective before head
- I Tim 4:14 Attributive phrase before head
- I Tim 6:12 Adjective before head

²The relative in vs. 5 has a different head.

³Assuming that $\mu\upsilon\sigma\tau\eta\phi\iota\omicron\nu$ is the head for the relative clause.

72 Relative Clauses
35 in Homologoumena; 37 in Antilegomena

2a. Anarthrous Head--More than one Attribute

Rom 9:23-24	<u>Two</u> relative clauses
I Cor 2:7-8	Attributive Participle and <u>Two</u> relative clauses
I Cor 5:1	Correlative attributive
I Cor 6:8	Attributive before Head (πᾶν)
I Cor 15:6	Numerical attributives before head
II Cor 9:2	Attributive Before head (πᾶσαν)
II Cor 11:4a	Attributive before Head (ἄλλον)
II Cor 11:4b	Attributive after head (ἕτερον)
II Cor 11:4c	Attributive after head (ἕτερον)
Gal 1:7	Attributive before Head (ἕτερον)
Phil 2:15	Co-ordinate attributive after head
Eph 2:10	Attributive after head
I Tim 1:4	Attributive after Head
I Tim 1:6	Compound Head each with attributive
I Tim 1:19	Attributive before head
I Tim 6:9	Co-ordinate heads some with attributives
II Tim 1:13	Attributive before head
II Tim 2:2	Attributive before head
Titus 1:2	Attributive after Relative
Titus 3:6	Attributive after relative

22 Relative Clauses
13 in Homologoumena; 9 in Antilegomena

2b. Anarthrous Head--Relative only Attributives

Rom 1:2; 2:29; 8:15; 14:22a

I Cor 3:5; 7:13

Phil 3:20

I Thes 2:13

Eph 3:11; 5:4, 5; 5:18

Col 2:17

I Tim 1:15, 20b; 3:15; 4:3; 6:4

Titus 1:3

19 Relative Clauses
8 in Homologoumena; 11 in Antilegomena

3. Proper Name As Head

Rom 1:5	+ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ	+ ATT PTC	+ ATT PTC
	+ 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ	+ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν	+ RELCL
Rom 1:9	+ ὁ θεός	+ RELCL	
Rom 2:6-8	+ τοῦ θεοῦ	+ RELCL	
Rom 3:25	+ Χριστῷ 'Ιησοῦ	+ RELCL	
Rom 3:30	+ ὁ θεός	+ RELCL	
Rom 4:16-18	+ Ἀβραάμ	+ Two RELCL	
Rom 4:25	+ 'Ιησοῦν	+ τὸν κύριον	+ RELCL
Rom 5:2a	+ τοῦ κυρίου	+ 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ	+ RELCL
Rom 5:11	+ τοῦ κυρίου	+ 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ	+ RELCL
Rom 5:14	+ Ἀδάμ	+ RELCL	

Rom 16:4	+Πρίσκαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν	+ Art. Appositive	
	+ <u>Two</u> RELCL		
Rom 16:5	+Ἐπαίνετον	+ Art. Appositive	
	+ RELCL		
Rom 16:6	+Μαρτίαν	+ RELCL	
Rom 16:7	+Ἀνδρόνικον καὶ Ἰουνίαν	+ <u>Two</u> art	
	appositives	+ <u>Two</u> RELCL	
Rom 16:12	+Περσίδα	+ Art. Appositives	
	+ RELCL		
Rom 16:27	+ Attributive	+ θεῶ	+ RELCL
I Cor 1:8	+τοῦ κυρίου	+ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ	+ RELCL
I Cor 1:9	+ὁ θεός	+ RELCL	
I Cor 1:30-31	+Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ	+ RELCL	
I Cor 4:5	+ὁ κύριος	+ RELCL	
I Cor 4:17	+Τιμόθεον	+ <u>Two</u> RELCL	
I Cor 8:6a	+εἷς θεός	+ὁ πατήρ	+ RELCL
I Cor 8:6b	+εἷς κύριος	+ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός	+ RELCL
I Cor 10:13a	+ὁ θεός	+RELCL	
I Cor 15:15	+τὸν Χριστόν	+ RELCL	
II Cor 1:10	+τῷ θεῷ	+ Att Part Ph	+ <u>Two</u> RELCL
II Cor 3:6	+τοῦ θεοῦ	+ RELCL	
II Cor 4:4	+τοῦ Χριστοῦ	+ RELCL	
II Cor 13:3	+τοῦ ἐν ἡμοῖς λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ	+ RELCL	
Gal 1:5	+τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός	+ RELCL	
Gal 6:4	+τοῦ κυρίου	+ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ	+ RELCL

Phl 2:6	+Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ	+RELCL	
Phl 3:8	+Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου	+RELCL	
Phl 3:21	+σωτῆρα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν	+RELCL	
Phm 10-13	+Ὁνήσιμον	+ <u>Three</u> RELCL	+adjph
II Th 3:3	+ὁ κύριος	+RELCL	
Col 1:7	+Ἐπαφρᾶ	+ArtApp +RELCL	+AttPtc
Col 1:28	+Χριστός	+ArtApp +RELCL	
Col 2:3	+τοῦ μυστηρίου	+Χριστός	+RELCL
Col 4:8	+Τύχικος	+ <u>Three</u> App	+RELCL
Col 4:9	+Ὁνησίμῳ	+ArtApp +RELCL	
Col 4:10a	+Μάρκος	+ArtApp +RELCL	
Col 4:10b	+ <u>Three</u> Names	+Art App for Each +AttPtc +RELCL	
Eph 2:21	+αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ	+RELCL	
Eph 3:15	+τὸν πατέρα	+RELCL	
Eph 4:16	+ἡ κεφαλὴ	+Χριστός	+RELCL
Eph 6:22	+Τύχικος	+ <u>Two</u> Art App	+RELCL
I Tm 2:4	+τοῦ σωτῆρος	+θεοῦ +RELCL	
I Tm 4:10	+θεῷ	+ζῶντι +RELCL	
II Tm 1:3	+τῷ θεῷ	+RELCL	
II Tm 2:18	+Ὑμέναιος καὶ Φίλητος	+RELCL	
II Tm 4:14	+Ἀλέξανδρος	+ArtApp +RELCL	
II Tm 4:18	+ὁ κύριος	+RELCL	
Tit 2:14	+τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ	+RELCL	

61 Relative Clauses⁴

41 in the Homologoumena; 20 in the Antilegomena

4a. Pronominal Head with Parallel Attributives

Gal 4:19	+ὁμᾶς	+ App (Anarth)	+ Rel Cl
Gal 4:24b	+μῖα	+ Ptc ph	+ Rel Cl
Phl 2:20	+οὐδενᾶ	+ ἰσόφυχον	+ Rel Cl
Phl 3:18-19	+πολλοί	+ Rel Cl	+ App + <u>Two</u> Rel Cl
Phl 4:3	+αὐταῖς	+ <u>Two</u> Rel Cl	
Col 2:10-12	+αὐτῷ	+ <u>Three</u> Rel Cl	

11 Relative Clauses

8 in the Homologoumena; 3 in the Antilegomena

4b. Pronominal Head with Relative Clause Only

αὐτός	Rom 1:24; Gal 6:16 ⁵ ; Eph 1:11 ⁶ ; 4:15; II Tm 2:17
-------	---

⁴The use of articular appositives and other attributival constructions with proper names, both human and divine, is most interesting. Note especially how often the apposition has an article when the head is anarthrous.

What is a common practice elsewhere in the corpus seems to be the rule in Colossians. Cf. Col 4:8 to Eph 6:22. Each proper name has one or more appositives. This, of course, is in keeping with our earlier observation of the appositional nature of the style of this epistle.

⁵Gal 6:16 is the attributival relative clause in the Homologoumena in which the relative clause begins the sentence and precedes the head. However, the relative in this case is ὅσοι and relative clauses introduced by forms of ὅσος regularly come first in the sentences which contain them (except in Col 2:1 and in clauses introduced by ἐφ' ὅσον).

⁶Eph 1:11 may resume the pronominal phrase ἐν αὐτῷ. But cf. the analysis of this stereotyped poem in chapter IV. There it was shown that both the pronoun and the relative clause resume the substantival participial phrase. For that reason it is not counted in this section.

τις, τι	Rom 3:8; I Tm 1:20a
ἐγώ	Rom 4:24; I Cor 10:11; 15:9; II Cor 10:1
ἐκεῖνος	Rom 14:15
τίς, τί	I Cor 4:7
οὐδεὶς	I Cor 6:5
οὐ	II Cor 8:10; Gal 3:1
πᾶς	Eph 3:20-21; Col 3:17 ⁷

18 Relative Clauses

12 in the Homologoumena; 6 in the Antilegomena

5. Attributival Clauses Resuming a Clause Construction

Gal 2:10	A Purpose Clause
Gal 4:34a	Series of Statements
Phl 1:28	Preceding Clause
Col 2:22	Series of Prohibitions
Eph 3:13	Head Clause
Eph 6:2	Old Testament Quotation

6 Relative Clauses

3 in the Homologoumena; 3 in the Antilegomena

6. Attributival Clauses Before the Head

Rom 2:16	ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρα
----------	------------

⁷Col 3:17 is the only case in the Antilegomena in which the relative clause (an attributival clause) precedes either the head or the head clause. This clause is unusual in several respects. It is one of the two examples of relative clauses introduced by πᾶς (compare Rom 14:23b). It manifests the only accusative form of ὅστις in the Corpus. The particle ἐάν occurs with ὅστις only here and in I Cor 16:2 and Gal 5:10. Note the lack of concord between πᾶν ὃ τι ἐάν and πάντα. The analogue for this clause is probably that of the substantival relative clauses resumed in the following head clause by a demonstrative.

Rom 4:17	κατέναντι οὗ...θεοῦ
Rom 6:17	εἰς ὅν...τρόπον
Rom 7:1	ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον...
Rom 16:2	ἐν ᾧ ἄν...πράγματι
I Cor 7:39	ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον...
Gal 4:1	ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον...
Col 1:6	ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας...
Col 1:9	ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας...
II Tm 1:6a	δι' ἣν αἰτίαν...
II Tm 1:12a	δι' ἣν αἰτίαν...
II Tm 3:18	ὅν τρόπον...
Tit 1:13-14	δι' ἣν αἰτίαν...
3 Clauses -- All in Homologoumena ⁸	

⁸In our corpus the relative clause precedes the head only when the head is part of an exocentric construction. The placing of part of an attributival constituent before and the remainder after the head is not uncommon in Greek. However, the examples in our corpus in which the head is found within the relative clause are all illustrations of adverbial connectives which developed out of much used relative constructions. For this reason only Rom 4:17; 6:17; and 6:2 are counted as attributival relative clauses.

APPENDIX II

SUBSTANTIVAL FUNCTIONS OF THE ANTECEDENTS

OF ADJECTIVAL RELATIVE CLAUSES

I. Actor Antecedent

Romans	(2)	2:29; 3:8
I Corinthians	(4)	3:14; 4:5; 7:24; 7:13 (ἔστις)
II Corinthians	(2)	3:14 (ἔστις); 10:1
Galatians	(2)	3:19b; 5:10 (ἔστις)
Philippians	(3)	3:18, 19a, 19b
Ephesians	(2)	4:19; 5:5
Colossians	(4)	3:15; 4:8, 10; 4:11 (ἔστις)
I Timothy	(3)	1:20a; 6:16a, 16b
II Timothy	(4)	1:15; 2:18 (ἔστις); 4:15, 18
	<u>26</u>	

II. Subject Antecedent

Romans	(5)	1:9; 2:15 (ἔστις); 3:30; 8:34a, 34b
I Corinthians	(10)	1:9; 3:17 (ἔστις); 6:5, 18; 8:6a, 6b; 10:13a, 16a, 16b; 15:9
II Corinthians	(1)	4:6
Galatians	(3)	4:24b, 26; 5:20 (all ἔστις)
Ephesians	(3)	2:21, 22, 6:22
II Thessalonians	(2)	3:3, 17
I Timothy	(2)	1:20b; 6:10
Titus	(2)	1:11a, 11b (ἔστις)
	<u>28</u>	

III. Identifier Antecedent

Romans	(1)	10:8
I Corinthians	(1)	3:5
Galatians	(1)	5:21
Ephesians	(1)	4:16
Colossians	(1)	1:28
	<u>5</u>	

IV. Undergoer Antecedent

Romans	(16)	1:25 (ἔστις), 27, 32 (ἔστις); 4:25; 6:17; 8:15; 11:2; 14:15, 22a; 16:4, 4 (ἔστις); 5b, 6 (ἔστις), 7a (ἔστις) 7b, 12 (ἔστις)
--------	------	--

I Corinthians	(16)	2:7, 8, 13; 4:7, 17a, 17b; 5:1 (ἵσταναι and passive); 8:11 (passive) 11:23; 14:37; 15:1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 3, 15, 31
II Corinthians	(10)	2:4, 9; 8:18, 22; 9:2; 10:2; 11:14a, 14b, 14c, 15 (passive)
Galatians	(4)	1:23; 2:2, 4; 3:1
Philippians	(3)	2:20 (ἵσταναι); 3:21; 4:10
I Thessalonians	(2)	1:10; 2:13
Philemon	(1)	5
Ephesians	(6)	3:4 (passive); 4:30; 5:4 (passive); 6:16, 17, 20
Colossians	(9)	1:5; 2:14, 19; 3:5 (ἵσταναι), 6, 7, 14; 4:3, 17
II Thessalonians	(3)	2:8 (passive), 9 (passive), 15
I Timothy	(6)	1:4 (ἵσταναι), 15, 19; 2:5 (object complement); 4:14; 6:12
II Timothy	(3)	1:6b; 4:8 (passive), 13
	<u>79</u>	

V. Dative Antecedent

Benefactee	Rom 16:27; I Cor 15:6; Gal 3:16 (?); Phl 4:3; Col 1:13, 27a; II Tm 1:3; II Cor 8:10 (ἵσταναι); Phl 4:3 (ἵσταναι); Eph 1:23 (ἵσταναι); II Th 1:9 (ἵσταναι); II Tm 2:2 (ἵσταναι)
Agent/Inst	Eph 1:14; 5:18
Location/Cause?	Eph 2:2

VI. Genitive Antecedent

Rom 2:6; 4:16, 18; 4:6; 5:14; I Cor 1:8; 6:19; 10:11;
II Cor 1:6; 4:4; 13:3; Gal 1:5; 6:14; Phl 3:8;
Eph 1:6, 8; 4:1; Col 1:14, 15, 18, 23a, 23b, 27b; 2:3;
II Th 1:5; I Tm 4:3, 6; 6:20; II Tm 1:6 (ἵσταναι),
1:13; 2:17; Titus 1:2; 2:14; 3:6

VII. Antecedent Governed By Preposition

εἰς	Rom 1:2; 5:2b; II Cor 9:11 (ἵσταναι); Gal 1:7; Eph 4:15; I Tm 6:9 (ἵσταναι)
περί + GEN	Rom 1:5(?), 6(?); II Cor 10:8; Phm 10, 12, 13; I Tm 6:4

παρά + ACC

Rom 1:25; 16:17; I Cor 3:11

ἐν

Rom 3:25; 16:2; I Cor 1:30;
7:20; 11:23b; II Cor 4:4a;
7:7; Phl 2:26; 3:20; Eph 1:7,
11, 13a, 13b; 2:3; 3:5;
Col 2:10, 11, 12, 17; II Th 1:4;
I Tm 3:15 (ἔστις); Tit 1:3

διὰ + ACC

Rom 4:24; Gal 2:4 (ἔστις), 5;
Eph 2:4; Col 1:5b

διὰ + GEN

Rom 5:2a, 11; II Cor 1:4;
Eph 3:7, 12; II Tm 1:11

ὑπέρ + GEN

Rom 9:4 (ἔστις), 4, 5a, 5b;
Col 1:24, 25

ἐπὶ + ACC

Rom 9:23, 24; Gal 4:9

ἐπὶ + DAT

II Cor 1:10a, 10b; 12:21;
I Th 3:9; Eph 2:10; I Tm 4:10;
II Tm 2:9

ἐκ

II Cor 3:6, 10; I Tm 1:6;
Tit 3:5

κατά + ACC

II Cor 10:13; Eph 1:9, 20;
3:11; Col 2:23; II Th 3:6;
I Tm 1:11

ἀπό

Col 1:7

κατέναντι

Rom 4:17

μέσον

Phl 2:15

πρός + ACC

Gal 4:19a; Eph 3:15

σύν + DAT

Col 4:9

ἐνώπιον

I Tm 2:4

μέχρι

I Tm 6:15

APPENDIX III

SUBSTANTIVAL RELATIVE CLAUSES

The substantival relative clauses are listed below according to function. Cases of attraction and non-attraction are noted where relevant. Unless otherwise noted the relative is some form of ὅς. An apostrophe (') indicates sentences in which both clauses contain the same predicate and an asterisk (*) sentences in which the predicate of the relative precedes in time the main predicate.

Actor with Intransitive Predicate

Rom 2:12a (ὅσοι)*; Rom 6:2 (ὅστις)*

Actor with Transitive Active Predicate

Rom 2:23; 8:32*; I Cor 7:37*; 11:27*; 15:36*;
Gal 3:27 (ὅσοι); 6:12 (ὅσοι)*; Phil 3:15 (ὅσοι)*;
I Tim 6:1 (ὅσοι)*

Undergoer with Transitive Passive Predicate

Rom 2:12b (ὅσοι)*; 6:3 (ὅσοι); 15:4 (ὅσοι)';
Gal 5:4 (ὅστις)¹

Undergoer with Transitive Active Predicate²

Rom 3:19 (ὅσοι)'; 4:21*; 7:15a, 15b*, 15c*, 16*,

¹Although the predicate of the relative clause is in the present tense and that of the head clause is an aorist, this sentence demands that the relative clause precede the head clause.

²There are several passages in which the predicative word-choice indicates that the relative clause is anterior in time to the head clause, although the moods and tenses of the predicates do not indicate that relationship. Gal 5:4 is

19a*, 19b*, 20*; 8:24, 25, 29, 30a, 30b, 30c;
 9:18a, 18b; 10:14a*; 11:7; I Cor 4:6³; 7:36*;
 10:15*, 20; 16:2 (ἔστιν)*, 3*; II Cor 1:17';
 2:10a', b'; 11:12a'*, 17'; Gal 2:18*; 5:17*;
 6:7*; Phl 2:5*; 3:16*; 4:8a (ἕως)*, 8b (ἕως)*,
 8c (ἕως)*, 8d (ἕως)*, 8e (ἕως)*, 8f (ἕως)*,
 9*; Phm 21*⁴; II Th 3:4*; Col 2:18; 3:17 (ἔστιν),
 23', 25*, I Tm 1:7; II Tm 1:12b*, 18 (ἕως)*;
 2:2*, 7*; Tit 1:11b; 2:1*

Undergoer with Intransitive Predicate (Cognate Acc.)

Rom 6:10a', b'

such an example as was indicated in the footnote above. Another example of a gnomic present tense predicate in the relative clause anterior to an aorist predicate in the head clause is Rom 11:7. The same time relationship seems to exist between the predicate in Rom 8:29, 30a, 30b, 30c; I Cor 15:3.

³I Cor 4:6 and Phm 3:21 differ from the other substantival clauses functioning as undergoers with transitive active predicate. Both are relative clause connected to the larger construction by ὑπέρ.

⁴Phm 21 is actually an example of a comparative substantival relative clause connected to the remainder of the sentence by ὑπέρ; thus, becoming a comparative construction. In turn this comparative construction functions as an undergoer with the predicate of the head clause. Note that in Phm 21 the comparative clause precedes the head predicate as do most of the relative clauses used as undergoers with transitive active predicates while it follows in I Cor 4:6. That the comparative clause functions as a substantival undergoer is also indicated by the introductory article.

Undergoer with Ditransitive Active Verb⁵

I Cor 11:23a; 14:37*; 15:3*; Phl 3:7

Subject with Copula PredicateRom 2:15 (ὅστις); 8:14 (ὅσος); 14:21⁶, 27';

II Cor 1:20 (ὅσος); 12:13*; Gal 3:10 (ὅσος)

Identifier with Copula PredicateRom 8:34b⁷; I Cor 15:10; II Cor 4:6Benefactor⁸(1) I Cor 7:39⁹; 12:23¹⁰

⁵In Phil 3:7 the predicate of the head clause is clearly di-transitive. The other might be analyzed in any of several ways, e.g. the relative clauses may be referents or the ὅτι clauses may be appositives or epexegetical constructions. However, I have chosen to identify the predicates as di-transitive because both the relative clauses and the ὅτι clauses can be interpreted as the undergoer.

⁶Rom 14:21 provides an extra characteristic of substantival relative clauses, i.e. they may be used in coordinate relationship with other substantival constituents (in this case infinitival phrases). Cf. also Col 2:1 below. This example is also interesting because the clause is introduced by ἐν ᾧ, a construction which in no way connects the relative clause to the main clause.

⁷Rom 8:34a may also be an identifier. The absence of a coordinating connective between the two relative clauses and the fact that the argument against a condemner is in Rom 8:30b recommends the identification of the latter as the only identifier constituent in the sentence.

⁸Non-nuclear substantival relative clauses are classified as follows: (1) No governing preposition; (2) Preposition belongs to relative only; (3) Preposition belongs only to substantival function; (4) Preposition belongs to both; (5) Relative without incorporated head serves as connective; (6) Relative with incorporated head serve as functional connective.

⁹Relative may be attracted. However, the infinitive is probably to be understood in both relative and head clause.

¹⁰Function indicated by dative demonstrative.

- (2) None
- (3) Col 2:1 (ἕσος) (ὁπέρ...ἕσος)¹¹
- (4) I Cor 10:30
- (5) None
- (6) None

Possessor

- (1) Rom 6:16a, 16b (both not attracted)
- (2) None
- (3) None
- (4) None
- (5) None
- (6) None

Source

- (1) Rom 15:18; II Cor 12:17 (both attracted)
- (2) Rom 6:21¹²
- (3) II Cor 2:3 (ἄφ' -- attraction)
- (4) None
- (5) None
- (6) None

Location

- (1) None

¹¹Relative clause is coordinated (see καί) with two genitival substantives connected to sentence by ὁπέρ. The coordination with other substantivals is similar to Rom 14:21. On the other hand, this is the only ἕσος clause in our corpus, except the formulaic ἕφ' ἑσος examples, which does not introduce the head clause.

¹²Substantive would be in genitive without a functional connective.

- (2) None
- (3) None
- (4) I Cor 7:4 (ἐν)¹³; II Cor 11:12b (ἐν)
Phl 4:11 (ἐν); I Tim 3:14
- (5) None
- (6) None

Instrument

- (1) I Tim 2:10¹⁴
- (2) None
- (3) Rom 14:22 (ἐν -- relative attracted)
- (4) Rom 2:1 (ἐν)
- (5) None
- (6) None

Comparative

- (1) II Cor 1:13¹⁵
- (2) None
- (3) Rom 12:3 (παρ'), I Cor 4:6 (ὕπερ -- not attracted)¹⁶

¹³This is the only example in the corpus of the repetition of the connective: ἐν ᾧ..., ἐν τούτῳ....

¹⁴That the relative clause is instrumental in this case is indicated by the use of the correlative connectives μή...ἀλλά.... In this exocentric construction the relative clause is contrasted to a series of dative case substantives introduced by ἐν. The appositive δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν which follows the relative clause also indicates an instrumental as well as a substantival function.

¹⁵The function of the relative clause in II Cor 1:13 is indicated by the regular comparative formula.

¹⁶The comparative clause is actually the under-goer of the transitive active predicate in the head clause, as the definite article indicates in I Cor 4:6.

I Cor 10:13b (ὁπέρ); II Cor 5:10 (πρόϋ);
 12:6 (ὁπέρ); Gal 1:8 (παρ'), 9 (παρ');
 Phm 21 (ὁπέρ)

- (4) None
- (5) None
- (6) II Tm 3:8¹⁷

Cause

- (1) None
- (2) None
- (3) None
- (4) II Cor 11:21 (ἐν)
- (5) Rom 5:12 (ἐφ' ᾧ); 8:3 (ἐν ᾧ); II Cor 5:5
 (ἐφ' ᾧ); Phl 3:12 (ἐφ' ᾧ); II Th 2:10
 (ἐν ᾧ)¹⁸
- (6) None

Referent

- (1) I Cor 15:37¹⁹; Gal 1:20²⁰

¹⁷The comparative relationship is indicated by the correlative subordinating conjunctions.

¹⁸That the relative in these clauses is part of the connective is clear from the fact that it does not serve any function either within the relative clause or within the head clause. This is characteristic of all the relative clauses classified under (5) and (6).

¹⁹The relative clause in I Cor 15:37 does not function as a constituent in its clause. Rather it introduces the clause and designates the subject being discussed.

²⁰Gal 1:20 is the only example of a relative clause used as a referent which follows the classical pattern. In that form the relative clause designating the subject discussed introduces the sentence and the head clause is introduced by ὅτι. Cf. Herbert Weir Smyth, Greek Grammar. Rev. by Gordon M. Messing. (Cambridge, 1963), p. 2494.

- (2) Rom 7:6 (ἐν)
- (3) I Cor 7:1 (περὶ relative attracted)
- (4) None
- (5) None
- (6) None

Temporal

- (1) None
- (2) None
- (3) None
- (4) None
- (5) Rom 11:13 (ἐφ' ὅσον, 25 (ἄχρι οὖ)); I Cor 11:26 (ἄχρι οὖ); 15:25 (ἄχρι οὖ); Gal 4:19b (μέχρις οὖ)
- (6) Rom 2:16 (ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ; 7:1 (ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον); I Cor 7:39 (ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον); Gal 4:1 (ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον); Col 1:6 (ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας), 9 (ἀφ' ἧς ἀμέρας)

APPENDIX IV

INDEFINITE RELATIVE CLAUSES

Romans (48):

1:24 (οἵτινες), 32 (οἵτινες); 2:1, 12a (ὅσοι), 12b (ὅσοι), 15 (οἵτινες)², 23; 3:8², 19 (ὅσα); 4:6², 21; 6:2 (οἵτινες), 3 (ὅσοι), 16a¹, 16b¹, 21; 7:1 (ἐφ' ὅσον), 15a, 15b, 15c, 16 (ὁ οὗ), 19a, 19b (ὁ οὗ), 20 (ὁ οὗ); 8:14 (ὅσοι)³, 24^{1,3}, 25, 29³, 30a³, 30b, 30c; 9:18a¹, 18b¹, 21a, 21b; 10:14a³, 14b³; 11:7, 13 (ἐφ' ὅσον); 14:2, 5a², 5b², 15², 21, 22b, 23; 15:4 (ὅσα); 16:2 (ὃ ἄν).

I Corinthians (23):

4:6; 6:18 (ὃ ἔάν); 7:7a, 7b, 13 (ἥτις)³, 20, 24, 36, 37, 39a (ἐφ' ὅσον), 39; 10:13b, 20, 30; 11:21a², 21b², 27 (ὃς ἄν); 12:8², 23; 15:36¹, 37¹; 16:2 (ὃ τι ἔάν), 3 (οὗς ἔάν).

II Corinthians (15):

1:13², 17, 20 (ὅσα); 2:10a¹, 10b^{1,2,3}, 5:10; 9:11 (ἥτις); 11:14a (ὃν οὐκ)², 4b (ὃ οὐκ)², 4c (ὃ οὐκ)², 12a, 12b, 17, 21 (ὃ ἄν); 12:6.

Galatians (11):

3:10 (ὅσον)⁴, 27 (ὅσον); 4:1 (ἐφ' ὅσον), 8¹, 9¹; 5:4 (οἵτινες)³, 10 (ὅστις ἔάν), 17 (ὃ ἔάν); 6:7 (ὃ ἔάν), 12 (ὅσον), 16 (ὅσοι).

¹Identified as indefinite by Ernest De Witt Burton, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek. 3rd ed. (Edinburgh, 1898), para. 301-315.

²Note the use of such indefinite antecedents as τις, πᾶς, ἄνθρωπος, ἕκαστος, etc.

³Note the parallel clauses introduced by εἰ or ἔάν in the context.

⁴Note the parallel between the ὅσοι clause in 3:10a and the πᾶς ὃς οὐκ clause in 3:10b.

Philippians (14):

2:15; 3:7 (ἐτινὸς, 15 (ἔσσι)⁵, 18⁶, 19a⁶, 19b⁶;
4:8 (ἔσσι-6x)⁵, 7, 9⁵, 11.

I Thessalonians (1):

3:9⁶

Philemon (1):

21

II Thessalonians (2?):

1:9; 3:4

Colossians (4):

2:1 (ἔσσι); 3:17 (πάν ὃ τι ἐάν)⁶; 23 (ὃ ἐάν); 25.

Ephesians (0):I Timothy (11):

1:4 (οἵτινες), 6, 7, 15, 19, 20a; 2:10; 4:3;
6:1 (ἔσσι), 9 (αἵτινες), 21.

II Timothy (10):

1:13, 15⁶, 18 (ἔσσι); 2:2a, 2b (οἵτινες), 7, 17⁶,
20a, 20b; 3:14.

Titus (4):

1:11a⁶, 11b (οἵτινες), 11c (ἄμφ); 2:1.

⁵See n. 3 above.

⁶See n. 2 above.

⁷See n. 1 above.

APPENDIX V

SUBSTANTIVAL AND CONNECTIVE FUNCTIONS OF PAULINE RELATIVES
(within the Relative Clauses)1a. Actor Nominative with Transitive Active Verb

- ὁς Rom 2:6; 3:30; 8:32; 14:2; 5a, 5b;
I Cor 4:5; 6:5; 10:13; 11:27; II Cor 1:10a;
I Th 5:24; Col 1:13; II Th 3:3; I Tm 2:4;
Tit 2:14.
- ὅστις Rom 1:25, 32; 16:4, 6, 12; II Cor 8:10; 9:11;
Phl 2:20; Eph 4:19; II Th 1:9; I Tm 1:4;
6:9; Tit 1:11.
- ὅσος Gal 6:12; Col 2:1.

1b. Actor Nominative with Di-Transitive Verb

- ὁς I Cor 1:8; 4:17b; II Cor 3:6; Phl 3:21.
- ὅστις Rom 2:15.

1c. Actor Nominative with An Intransitive Verb

- ὁς Rom 2:23; 8:34; I Cor 11:21a, 21b; II Cor 4:6;
13:3; I Th 2:13; I Tm 2:10; Tit 2:1.
- ὅστις Rom 6:2; Gal 2:4; Phl 4:3; II Tm 5:6.
- ὅσος Rom 2:12a, 12b; Gal 6:16.

1d. Actor Nominative with Verbs of More Than One Class

- ὁς Rom 4:18; I Cor 7:37; II Cor 10:1; Phl 2:6.
- ὅστις II Tm 2:18.

2a. Subject Nominative with Copula Verb

- ὁς Rom 1:25; 4:16; 5:14; 8:34a; 16:5, 7;
I Cor 1:30; 3:11; 4:17a; 15:9; Gal 1:7;
3:6; Eph 1:14; 4:15; 5:5; 6:17; Col 1:7,
15, 18, 24, 27b; 2:10, 14; 3:14; 4:9;
II Th 3:11; I Tm 4:10; II Tm 1:6b.
- ὅστις Rom 9:4; 16:7; Gal 4:24b, 26; 5:19; Phl 1:28;
3:7; Eph 1:23; 3:13; 6:2; Col 3:5; 4:11;
II Tm 2:2; 3:15.

ῥοος Gal 3:10; Phl 4:8a; I Tm 6:1

2b. Subject Nominative Without an Expressed Copula

ῥς Rom 14:23b; I Cor 7:7a, 7b; Phl 2:5;
II Tm 2:20a, 20b.

ῥοις I Cor 5:1.

ῥοος II Cor 1:20; Phl 3:15; 4:8 (5x).

3. Identifier Nominative with a Copula Verb

ῥς I Cor 15:10.

ῥοις I Cor 3:7; Gal 5:10.

4a. Undergoer Nominative with Transitive Passive Verb

ῥς Rom 4:25; I Cor 4:6; Eph 3:5; I Tm 4:14.

ῥοις I Cor 16:2; Gal 5:4.

ῥοος Rom 6:3; 8:14; 15:4; Gal 3:27.

4b. Undergoer Genitive with Transitive Active Verb

ῥς Rom 10:14b; Col 1:23a; I Tm 1:6; 6:10;
II Tm 1:13.

4c. Undergoer Dative with Transitive Active Verb

ῥς Rom 1:9; 4:17; 6:16b; 16:2; Gal 4:9;
I Tm 4:6; II Tm 1:3, 12b.

4d. Undergoer Dative with Di-transitive Active Verb

ῥς II Cor 2:10

4e. Undergoer Accusative with Transitive Active Verb

ῥς Rom 1:2, 27; 4:21; 7:15a, 15b, 15c, 16, 19a,
19b, 20; 8:24, 25, 29, 30a, 30b, 30c; 9:18a,
18b, 23, 24; 10:8; 11:2, 7; 12:3; 14:22a,
22b; 15:18; 16:17; I Cor 2:7, 8, 13;
3:14; 4:7; 6:18, 19; 7:36; 10:13b, 15, 16a,
16b, 20; 11:23a; 12:23, 28; 14:37; 15:1a,
1b, 3, 15, 36, 37; 16:3; II Cor 1:4, 6, 13,
17; 2:4, 10b; 5:10; 7:7; 8:22; 9:2; 10:2,
8, 13; 11:4a, 4b, 4c, 12b, 17; 12:17, 21;
13:10; Gal 1:6, 9, 20, 23; 2:2, 4, 10, 18;
4:19a; 5:17; 6:7; Phl 3:18; 4:9; I Th 1:10;
3:9; Phm 5, 10, 12, 13, 21; Eph 1:6, 8, 9, 20;

2:4, 10; 3:11; 4:1; 6:22; Col 1:4, 5,
28; 2:18; 3:23, 25; 4:8, 17; II Th 1:4;
2:8; 3:4, 6; I Tm 1:7, 19, 20b; 4:3;
6:15, 16a, 21; II Tm 2:2, 7; 4:8, 13;
Tit 1:2, 11a, 11b; 3:5, 6.

800c Rom 3:19; II Tm 1:8.

4f. Undergoer Accusative with Di-transitive Active Verb

8c Rom 3:25; II Cor 12:6; II Th 2:15;
I Tm 1:11; Tit 1:3.

4g. Content Accusative with Intransitive Verb

8c Rom 6:10a, 10b; Gal 2:20.

5a. Benefactee Datives with Various Verb Types

8c Rom 4:6, 24; 6:11a; 16:4; I Cor 7:39;
12:8; Gal 2:5; 3:1, 19b; Col 1:27a.

5b. Benefactee Datives without Verbs

8c Rom 16:27; I Cor 2:16a, 16b; Gal 1:5;
I Tm 6:16b; II Tm 4:18.

5c. Benefactee Genitives with Connective

8c Rom 14:15; Eph 6:20; II Th 1:5.

5d. Benefactee Accusative with Connective

8c Rom 10:14a; I Cor 10:11; II Cor 1:10b.

6a. Agent Genitive with Connective

8c Rom 1:5; 5:2a, 11; I Cor 1:9¹; 3:5; 8:6b;
15:18; Gal 6:14.

6b. Agent Dative with Connective

8c Rom 8:15²; Eph 1:7, 11, 13a, 13b; 2:21, 22;
3:12; 4:30; 5:18; 6:16; Col 1:14; 2:11, 12.

¹With a transitive Passive Verb, 81d may on this occasion note the Actor.

²May show cause or instrument.

7. Possession Genitive

8c Rom 2:29; 3:8; 9:4; II Cor 8:18; 11:15;
Phl 3:19a, 10b; 4:3; Eph 3:7; Col 1:23b,
25; II Th 2:9.

8. Genitive of the Whole

8c I Tm 1:15, 20; II Tim 1:15; 2:17.

9. Source Genitive with Connectives

8c Rom 9:5b; I Cor 8:6; Phl 3:20; Eph 3:15;
4:16; Col 2:19; I Tm 6:4.

10a. Location Dative without Connective

8c I Cor 7:20; 11:23b.

10b. Location Dative with Connective

8c Rom 1:6; 5:2b; I Cor 7:24; 15:1c; Phl 2:15;
4:11; Eph 2:2; 3; Col 2:3.

11. Instrument Dative with Connective

8c Rom 7:6 (perhaps also 8:15).

12a. Cause Dative with Connective

8c Rom 6:21; 14:21; II Cor 11:12b, 21;
II Tm 2:9.

12b. Cause Accusative with Connective

8c I Cor 8:11; Phl 3:8; Col 3:6; 4:3.

13. Purpose or Goal Accusative with Connective

8c Rom 6:17; Phl 3:16; Col 1:29; 3:15;
I Tm 2:7; 6:12; II Tm 1:11.

14a. Referent Accusative without Connective

8c II Cor 12:13.

14b. Referent Accusative with Connective

8c Eph 3:4

15. Relative Functions as a Subordinating Connective

ἐν ᾧ	Rom 2:1; 8:3. (Causal)
ἐφ' ᾧ	Rom 5:12; II Cor 5:4; Phl 3:12. (Causal)
ἀνθ' ὧν	II Th 2:10. (Causal)
δι' ἣν αἰτίαν	II Tm 1:6a, 12a; Tit 1:13. (Causal)
ἄχρι οὗ	Rom 11:25; I Cor 11:26; 15:25. (Temporal)
μέχρις οὗ	Gal 4:19b. (Temporal)
ἐφ' ὅσον	Rom 7:1; 11:13; I Cor 7:39; Gal 4:1. (Temporal)
εἰς ὃ	II Th 1:11; 2:14. (Purpose)
ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας	Col 1:6, 9. (Temporal)
ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ	Rom 2:16.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Barrett, C. K. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.
Black's New Testament Commentaries. London,
1957 & 1962.
- Barth, Karl. The Epistle to the Romans. 6th ed. Tr. by
Edwyn C. Hoskyns. London, 1933.
- Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Test-
ament and Other Early Christian Literature.
4th ed. Tr. and Rev. by William R. Arndt and
F. Wilbur Gingrich. Chicago, 1957.
- Baur, F. C. Die Einleitung in das Neue Testament als
theologische Wissenschaft, theologische Jahr-
bücher. Vol. X. 1851.
- Baur, F. C. Die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe des Apostels
Paulus aufs neue kritisch untersucht. Stuttgart
and Tübingen, 1835.
- Baur, F. C. Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein
Leben und wirken, seine Briefe und sein Lehre.
Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des
Urchristentums. Stuttgart, 1845.
- Beyer, Klaus. Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament; Bd. 1,
Satzlehre Teil 1. 2nd ed. Göttingen, 1968.
- Black, Matthew. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and
Acts. 3rd ed. Oxford, 1967.
- Blass, F. and Debrunner, A. A Greek Grammar of the New
Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.
9th ed. Tr. and Rev. by Robert W. Funk. Chicago,
1961.
- Bornkamm, Günther. Paul. D. M. G. Stalker, trans.
New York, 1969.
- Brocklerann, Carl. Hebräische Syntax. Neukirchen, 1956.
- Brugmann, K. Greek Grammar. 4th ed. Ed. by A. Thumb.
Munich, 1913.

- Bultmann, Rudolf. Der Stil der Paulinischen Predigt und die dynisch-stoische Diatribe. No. 13 of Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Wilhelm Bousset, Ed. Göttingen, 1910.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. Theology of the New Testament. Kendrick Grobel, trans. New York, 1951.
- Burton, Ernest De Witt. Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek. 3rd ed. Edinburgh, 1898.
- Buttmann, Alexander. A Grammar of the New Testament Greek. J. H. Thayer, Tr. Andover, 1873.
- Conzelmann, Hans. Der erste Brief an die Korinther. 11th ed. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen, 1969.
- Conzelmann, Hans. Die Pastoralbriefe, 3rd ed. Vol. 13 of Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Günther Bornkamm, ed. Tübingen, 1955.
- Cullmann, Oscar. The Earliest Christian Confessions. J. K. S. Reid, Trans. London, 1949.
- De Wette, Wilhelm Martin Lebrecht. Historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 1826.
- Deichgräber, Reinhard. Gotteshymnus und Christus Hymnus in der frühen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen. Göttingen, 1967.
- Dibelius, Martin and Conzelmann, Hans. Die Pastoralbriefe. 3rd ed. Handbuch zum neuen Testament. Hans Lietzmann and Günther Bornkamm, eds. Tübingen, 1955.
- Dover, K. J. Greek Word Order. Cambridge, 1960.
- Erasmus of Rotterdam. Annotationes in Nouum Testamentum. Basel and Opera omnia, 1519.
- Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History, Bk. VI & Bk. VII. The Loeb Classical Edition. Cambridge, 1932.
- Feine, Paul, Behm, Johannes and Kümmel, Werner Georg. Introduction to the New Testament. 11th rev. ed. A. J. Mattill, Jr., trans. New York and Nashville, 1965.
- Frisk, Hjalmar. Studien zur griechischen Wortstellung, Göteborgs Högskolas Arsskrift XXXIX. Göteborg, 1932.

- Gesenius, Heinrich Friedrich Wilhelm and Kautzsch, E. Hebrew Grammar. 2nd English ed. Rev. by A. E. Cowley. Oxford, 1910.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. The Key to Ephesians. 1956.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. The Meaning of Ephesians. A Study of the Origin of the Epistle. 1933.
- Goodwin, W. W. Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb. Revised. Boston, 1889.
- Goodwin, W. W. and Gulick, B. Greek Grammar. Boston, 1930.
- Harris, Zellig S. String Analysis of Sentence Structure. Papers in Formal Linguistics, no. 1. The Hague, 1964.
- Harrison, P. N. Paulines and Pastorals. London, 1964.
- Harrison, P. N. The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles. Oxford, 1921.
- Herdan, Gustav. Quantitative Linguistics. London, 1964.
- Herdan, Gustav. Small Particle Statistics. New York, 1960.
- Herdan, Gustav. Type-Token Mathematics; A Textbook of Mathematical Linguistics. Gravenhage, 1960.
- Holtzmann, Heinrich Julius. Die Pastoralbriefe, kritisch und exegetisch bearbeitet. 1880.
- Holtzmann, Heinrich Julius. Kritik der Epheser--und Kolosserbriefe. Leipzig, 1872.
- Holtzmann, Heinrich Julius. Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Leipzig, 1886.
- Hunter, Archibald M. Paul and His Predecessors, 2nd rev. ed. Philadelphia, 1961.
- Jannaris, A. N. An Historical Greek Grammar. London, 1897.
- Julicher, Adolf. An Introduction to the New Testament. Janet Penrose, trans. New York, 1904.
- Kaibel, G. Stil und Text der politeia Athenaiou des Aristoteles. Berlin, 1893.

- Kroll, Josef. Die christliche Hymnodik bis zu Klemens von Alexandria, Verzeichnis der Vorlesungen an der Akademie zu Braunschweig (1921-22). Photography by Wissenschaftlichen Buchgesellschaft. Darmstadt, 1968.
- Kühner, R. Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache II Stazlehre. 3rd ed. by B. Gerth. Hönover and Leipzig, 1898-1904; reprinted 1955.
- Kühner, R. Syntaktische Forschungen IV. Quoted by Hjalmar Frisk, Studien zur griechischen Wortstellung, Göteborg Högskolas Arsskrift XXXIX. Göteborg, 1932.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. Das Neue Testament, Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme. Munich, 1958.
- Kuss, Otto. Der Römerbrief. Regensburg, 1963.
- Lietzmann, Hans. Messe und Herrenmahl. Bonn, 1926.
- Lietzmann, Hans. Symbolstudien I-XIV. Darmstadt, 1962.
- Leitzmann, Hans. Symbolstudien I-XIV, Vol III: Kleine Schriften. 5th Ser., Vol. 19 of Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Berlin, 1962.
- Loepfe, Alfred. Die Wortstellung in griechischen Sprechsatz erklärt an Stücken aus Platon und Menander. Freiburg in der Schweiz, 1940.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. Kyrios Jesus. Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2, 5-11. Der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Jahrgang 1927/28.4. Abhandlung. Darmstadt, 1961.
- Lohse, Eduard. Colossians and Philemon. William R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris, trans. Hermeneia--A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Helmut Koester, ed. Philadelphia, 1971.
- Longacre, Robert E. Grammar Discovery Procedures, A Field Manual. The Hague, 1964.
- Lund, N. W. Chiasmus in the New Testament, A Study in Formgeschichte. Chapel Hill and London, 1942.

- Martin, R. P. Carren Christi: Philipians ii. 5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship. Vol IV: Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series. Matthew Black, ed. Cambridge, 1967.
- Mayerhoff, Ernst Theodor. Der Brief an die Kolosser mit vornehmlicher Berücksichtigung der drei Pastoral Briefe kritisch geprüft. Berlin, 1838.
- Mayser, Edwin. Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit. 2nd ed. 3rd rev. 1936.
- Michel, Otto. Der Brief an die Römer. 10th ed. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen, 1955.
- Mitton, C. L. The Epistle to the Ephesians. Its Authorship, Origin, and Purpose. 1951.
- Morgenthaler, Robert. Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes. Frankfurt am Main, 1958.
- Morton, A. Q. and McLeman, James. Christianity in the Computer Age. New York, 1964.
- Morton, A. Q. and McLeman, James. Paul, the Man and the Myth; A Study in the Authorship of Greek Prose. New York, 1966.
- Moule, C. F. D. An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek. 2nd ed. Cambridge, 1959.
- Moulton, James Hope. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol III. Edinburgh, 1963.
- Moulton, James Hope and Howard, Wilbert Francis. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. II. Edinburgh, 1929.
- Moulton, J. H. Prolegomena. Vol. I of A Grammar of the New Testament Greek. 3rd ed. Edinburgh, 1908.
- Neufeld, Vernon H. The Earliest Christian Confessions. Vol. 5: New Testament Tools and Studies. Bruce M. Metzger, ed. Grand Rapids, 1963.
- Norden, Eduard. Agnostos Theos. Stuttgart, 1913.
- Norden, Eduard. Die Antike Kunstprosa. Stuttgart, 1958.

- Percy, Ernest. Die Probleme der Koloser--und Epheserbriefe. Lund, 1946.
- Peterson, Eric. Eis Theos. Gottingen, 1926.
- Pike, Kenneth L. Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Struggle of Human Behavior. Rev. ed. The Hague, 1967.
- Radermacher, L. Neutestamentliche Grammatik. Vol. I Part I of Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Ed. by Hans Lietzmann. Fribinger, 1912.
- Reicke, B. The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism. Copenhagen, 1946.
- Rigau, Beda. The Letters of St. Paul, Modern Studies. Stephen Yonick, D.F.M., S. S. L., trans. and ed. Chicago, 1968
- Rigaux, B. O. F. M. Saint Paul Les Epitres aux Thessaloniens. Paris, 1956.
- Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Nashville, 1934.
- Roon, A. van. Een onderzoek naar de authenticiteit van de brief aan de Efeziërs. Leiden, 1969.
- Sanday, William and Headlam, Arthur C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. 5th ed. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh, 1905.
- Schille, Gottfried. Frühchristliche Hymnen. Berlin, 1962 and 1965.
- Schille, Gottfried. Theologische Literaturzeitung. 1957.
- Schweitzer, Albert. Paul and His Interpreters. A Critical History. W. Montgomery, trans. New York, 1912 and 1964.
- Schwyzer, Eduard. Griechische Grammatik. Vol. 2: Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik. 2nd ed. Handbuch der Altertums Wissenschaft. walter Otto, ed. Munich, 1959.

- Smyth, Herbert Weir. Greek Grammar. Rev. by Gordon M. Messing. Cambridge, 1963.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert. New Testament Theology. John Moush, trans. New York, 1955.
- Turner, Nigel. Syntax. Vol. III of A Grammar of New Testament Greek by James Hope Moulton. Edinburgh, 1963.
- Weil, Henri. De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparees aux langues modernes. Paris, 1844, 1869, and 1879.
- Weiss, Johannes. Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik. Göttingen, 1897.
- Winer, George Benedict. A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament. 7th ed. by Gottlieb Lünemann. J. H. Thayer, tr. Andover, 1892.

Articles

- Behaghel, Otto. "Beziehungen zwischen Unbang und Reihenfolge von Satzgliedern," Indogermanische Forschungen, XXV. Berlin, 1909.
- Behaghel, Otto. "Zur Stellung des Verbs im Germanischen und Indogermanischen," Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung, LVI. Berlin, 1929.
- Bornkamm, Günther. "Das Bekenntnis im Hebräerbrief," Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum: Gesammelte Aufsätze Band II. Vol. 28 of Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie. E. Wolf, ed. München, 1959. Pp. 188-203.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. "Bekenntnis - und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief," Coniectanea Neotestamentica XI in honorem Antonii Fridrichsen Sexagenarii. Lund, 1947. Pp. 1-15.
- Cadbury, Henry J. "The Relative Pronouns in Acts and Elsewhere," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLII (1923), pp. 150-157.
- Danker, F. W. "Romans V. 12. 'Sin Under Law.'" New Testament Studies XIV. (1968), pp. 424-439.

- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. "Evangelium og apostel." Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift, 44 (Oslo, 1943), pp. 193-217.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. "Formgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Christusverkündigung in der Gemeindepredigt," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann, 2nd ed. W. Eltester, ed. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 21 (Berlin, 1957), pp. 3-9.
- Funk, Robert. "The Apostolic Parousia: Form and significance," Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox (Cambridge, 1967).
- Georgi, Dieter. "Der vorpaulinische Hymnus Phil 2, 6-11." Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag. Erich Dinkler, ed. (Tübingen, 1964), pp. 265-294.
- Grobel, Kendrick. "A Chiastic Retribution-Formula in Romans 2." Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag. Erich Dinkler, ed. (Tübingen, 1964), pp. 255-262.
- Gundry, Robert H. "The Form, Meaning, and Background of the Hymn Quoted in I Timothy 3:16." Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce on his 60th Birthday. Edited by W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin. (Grand Rapids, 1970), pp. 203-222.
- Herdan, G. and Grayston, K. "The Authorship of the Pastorals in the Light of Statistical Linguistics," New Testament Studies, VI, (1959-60), pp. 1-14.
- Herdan, Gustav. "Scholarship and the Computer," London Quarterly and Holborn Review XXXIV (1965).
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Chiasmus in den Paulusbriefen." Abba: Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte. (Göttingen, 1966), pp. 276-156.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Zur Gedankenführung in der paulinischen Briefen." Studia Paulina in Honorem Johannis de Zwaan Septuagenarii. J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik, eds. (Haarlem, 1953), pp. 146-154.

- Kasemann, Ernst. "A Primitive Christian Baptismal Liturgy," Essays on New Testament Theses. W. J. Montagne, trans. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 41. (London, 1964), pp. 149-168.
- Kramer, Helmut. "Zur sprachlichen Form der Eulogie Eph 1, 3-14." Wort und Dienst IX (1967), pp. 34-46.
- Kuhn, K. G. "Der Epheserbriefe im Lichte der Qumrantexte," New Testament Studies VII (1960-61)
- Kühmel, Werner Georg. "Paulusbriefe," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 3rd ed. Kurt Galling, et. al. eds. (Tübingen, 1961)
- Robinson, James M. "A Formal Analysis of Col 1:15-20" Journal of Biblical Literature IXXVI (1957).
- Robinson, James M. "Die Hodajot-Formeln in Gebet und Hymnus des Frühchristentums," Apothoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen. Walther Eltester and F. H. Kettler, eds. Vol. 30 of Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche. (Berlin, 1964), pp. 194-235.
- Sanders, Jack T. "Hymnic Elements in Ephesians 1-3." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche. Edited by Walther Eltester. LVI (1965), pp. 214-232.
- Schlesinger, K. "Zur Wortfolge im hebräischen Verbalsatz," Vetus Testamentum III (1953).
- Strecker, Georg. "Redaktion und Tradition im Christus-hymnus Phil 2 6-11." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche, LV (1964), pp. 63-78.
- Von Dobschütz, Ernst Adolf Alfred Oskar Adalbert. "Zum Wortschatz und Stil des Römerbriefs," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche, XXXIII (1934).
- Wifstrand, Albert. "Lukas och Sentusaginta," Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift, XVI, (Lund, 1940), pp. 253-262.
- Wifstrand, Albert. "Stylistic Problems in the Epistles of James and Peter," Studia Theologica, I (Aarhus, 1948), pp. 170-182.